DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 837 PS 022 503

AUTHOR Doherty, Gillian
TITLE Child Care Policy in Canada: An Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION Toronto Univ. (Ontario). Centre for Urban and Community Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto. Child Care Branch.
REPORT NO ISBN-1-896051-04-9
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 125p.; For related documents, see PS 022 501 and PS 022 502.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Canada Natives; *Child Caregivers; Child Welfare; *Day Care; *Day Care Centers; Disabilities; Economic Factors; Educational Needs; Educational Quality; Employer Supported Day Care; Family Day Care; Foreign Countries; Multicultural Education; Parent Attitudes; *Public Policy; Rural Areas; School Age Day Care; School Safety; Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This bibliography annotates research reports, key informed opinion, and survey articles from Canada, the United States, and other countries which are relevant to child care policy in Canada. Rather than a comprehensive list of materials, the bibliography is intended to provide information about the most recent and/or key materials on the topic. The annotations from research studies only identify findings that were statistically significant, and different findings from the same study may be described in different sections, as appropriate. The bibliography is arranged by subject in reverse chronological order. The following topics are covered: (1) family policy and child care in Canada; (2) family policy and child care in the provinces and territories; (3) child care and the broader social context; (4) the economics of child care; (5) family policy and child care in other countries; (6) the effects of child care; (7) parental child care needs and preferences; (8) quality; (9) health and safety; (10) the physical environment; (11) the adult work environment; (12) human resources; (13) contextual factors; (14) child care support services; (15) family day care; (16) school-age child care; (17) rural child care; (18) work-related child care; (19) aboriginal child care; (20) multicultural child care; and (21) child care for children with disabilities. Author and title indexes are included. (AC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 837

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

The Childcare Resource and Research Unit

Child Care Policy in Canada:
An Annotated Bibliography

Gillian Doherty

1994

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Friendly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 022503

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Doherty, Gillian, 1938-
Child care policy in Canada: An annotated bibliography

Includes index.
ISBN 1-896051-02-2

1. Child care - Government policy - Canada - Bibliography
2. Child care services - Government policy - Canada - Bibliography. I. University of Toronto. Childcare Resource and Research Unit. II. Title.

Z7164 D75C55 1994 016.3627 C94-930923-0

Copyright © Childcare Resource and Research Unit 1994

Portions of this material may be reproduced for personal or educational purposes if appropriate attribution is made.

For further information, contact the publisher:

Childcare Resource and Research Unit
Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto
455 Spadina Avenue, Room 406
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2G3
(416) 978-6895

Printed and bound in Canada by union labour at Action Printing and Graphics.

ISBN 1-896051-04-9

Child Care Policy in Canada:
An Annotated Bibliography

Gillian Doherty

1994

PREFACE AND THANKS

This bibliography annotates research reports, key informed opinion, and survey articles from Canada, the United States (and, in some sections, from other countries as well) which are relevant to child care policy in Canada. It is not intended to be a comprehensive list of materials. Rather, the intention is to provide information about the most recent and/or key material related to the topic in question. In most instances the user will be able to find earlier references on the same topic by accessing documents annotated in this bibliography which usually cite earlier works.

The annotations from research studies only identify findings that were statistically significant. The bibliography is arranged by subject. When appropriate, reference is made to annotations in other sections which are also relevant. The materials within a subject section are usually listed chronologically, with the most recently published materials listed first. It should be noted that in some cases, different findings from the same study are described in different sections, as appropriate.

Both AUTHOR and TITLE indexes are included.

Sincere gratitude is extended to Chris Gehman. Not only did he spend hours locating materials to be reviewed, he then had the onerous task of re-shelving and returning everything. Yet he never lost his good temper or helpfulness.

Appreciation is also extended to the Child Care Branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services (Ontario) and to Child Care Programs, Human Resources (Canada) for provision of funding to the Childcare Resource and Research Unit.

Martha Friendly
Lori Schmidt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.	Family policy and child care in Canada	1
2.	Family policy and child care: The provinces and territories	13
3.	Child care and the broader social context	29
4.	The economics of child care	33
5.	Family policy and child care in other countries	37
6.	The effects of child care	45
7.	Parental child care needs and preferences	51
8.	Quality	53
9.	Health and safety	59
10.	The physical environment	61
11.	The adult work environment	63
12.	Human resources	69
13.	Contextual factors	75
14.	Child care support services	81
15.	Family day care	83
16.	School-age child care	91
17.	Rural child care	95
18.	Work-related child care	99
19.	Aboriginal child care	103
20.	Multicultural child care	105
21.	Child care for children with disabilities	107
Appendix		
I	Author Index	113
II	Title Index	121

SECTION 1: FAMILY POLICY AND CHILD CARE IN CANADA

Introduction

Canada has no national child care legislation or broad national policy framework for the development or operation of child care services. The federal government's involvement in child care is limited to federal funding mechanisms. The most important of these are the child care provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) and the Child Care Expense Deduction under the *Income Tax Act*. Jurisdictional authority for licensing, controlling the available funds, developing and implementing standards, regulations, and operational standards rests with the provinces and territories.

This section provides citations for documents related to the federal government's role and responsibilities in child care. It is divided as follows:

- **Recent descriptive and policy documents and research**
- **National Strategy on Child Care**
- **Special Committee on Child Care**
- **Task Force on Child Care**

It should be noted that there is some overlap in content between Section 1 and the following two sections. Therefore, the user of this annotated bibliography who is seeking information on Canadian child care policy is advised to also review the annotations in Sections 2 and 3.

Section 2, which starts on page 13, provides information on provincial/territorial roles, responsibilities, policies, and practice. Section 3 looks at child care in the broader social context, including how this context affects child care policy development.

Recent descriptive and policy documents and research

Howe, N., & Jacobs, E. (in press). **Child care research: A case for Canadian national standards**. *Canadian Psychology*.

This article demonstrates how the research findings on the impact of staff training and regulatory requirements support the value of child care standards requiring certain levels of staff qualifications and specifying factors such as adult:child ratios. This article a) reviews the recent research with respect to the effect on quality of staff training and of government regulation of factors such as adult:child ratios and group size; b) presents a model indicating direct and indirect links between regulation, staff training, the quality of child care provided, and child development outcomes; c) discusses the critical differences between the American and Canadian demographics and attributes (e.g. the U.S. melting pot concept versus the Canadian policy of multiculturalism and bilingualism), and; d) uses the characteristics of the Canadian context to make recommendations for licensing and regulation of child care and for staff educational requirements.

Friendly, M. (in press). **Child care policy in Canada: Putting the pieces together**. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley, Ltd.

This book provides an overview of child care policy in Canada. It discusses why and how child care became part of Canada's public policy agenda, the key policy issues, the players in child care advocacy, and the current child care situation. The roles of different levels of government are discussed, as is the history of Canadian child care. Components of policy proposals (universality, comprehensiveness and high quality) are analyzed and key issues for the second half of the 1990s are identified. Charts presenting the main aspects of Canadian child care, including standards and regulations, training requirements, funding, family day care, kinds of services, aboriginal child care, and others, are presented province-by-province. A resource list is included.

Friendly, M. (1993). **Moving towards quality child care: Reflections on child care policy in Canada.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 3(2), 123-132.

This article indicates how research findings can be used in the development of child care policy. It: a) summarizes recent child development and child care research relevant to quality and to policy development; b) reviews current child care funding arrangements, such as subsidization through the Canada Assistance Plan, (CAP); c) describes the Task Force on Child Care and the Special Committee on Child Care and how they differed; d) identifies the main policy issues related to child care; e) discusses the principles suggested by child care advocates; f) critiques the 1988 proposed National Strategy on Child Care, and g) notes that federal child care policy is at the same stage as it was in 1966.

Goelman, H. (1992). **Day care in Canada.** In M.E. Lamb, K.J. Sternberg, C.-P. Hwang, & A.G. Broberg (Eds.), *Child care in context: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 223-263). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This article describes child care in Canada in the context of Canadian history, values, political culture and institutions. This chapter in a book of articles by authors from various countries: a) traces American and European influences on Canada's evolving child care services; b) comments on the impact of regionalism and the provincial-territorial-federal jurisdiction over child care; c) discusses the impact of the multilingual and multicultural aspects of Canada; d) discusses efforts in the 1980s to develop a comprehensive child care system; and e) identifies current issues which impact on child care such as the Free Trade Agreement and constitutional reform.

Canadian National Day Care Research Network. (1992). **Canadian National Child Care Study**. Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada, Health and Welfare Canada.

This study provides a basis for policy formulation by obtaining information about parents' child care needs and preferences, the factors influencing parental choice of child care type, the kind of care Canadian children currently receive, and the impact of various child care arrangements on parents. The sample consisted of 24,155 families with a child under age 13 with representation from each province. Children and families living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories were not included nor were aboriginal children and families living on reserves.

The method of this study used individual telephone or personal interviews with the parent identified as having primary responsibility for child care arrangements. All interviews were conducted using a standard interview questionnaire. Information about current policies and practices in each province and territory was provided by four to seven persons in each jurisdiction. The parent interviews were conducted in 1988 and the provincial and territorial information was collected in 1989.

The findings of the Study are provided in the following reports which are either already available or expected to be available in 1994. All reports can be obtained from Statistics Canada.

Lero, D.S., Pence, A.R., Shields, M., Brockman, L.M., & Goelman, H. (1992). ***Introductory Report***. This report provides a history of the Study, including its goals, objectives and methodology, and information about the survey sample. The research instruments used are presented in the Appendix.

Lero, D.S., Goelman, H., Pence, A.R., Brockman, L.M., & Nuttall, S. (1992). ***Parental work patterns and child care needs***. This report provides: a) information about parental work patterns in Canada; b) a profile of Canadian families with at least one child younger than age 13; c) information about parents' employment, including work schedules; and d) estimates of the volume of child care needed to enable parents to work. The findings of this part of the research are annotated in Section 7, Parental Child Care Needs and Preferences.

Pence, A.R., Griffin, S., Cozier-Smith, D., McDonell, L., & Lewis, L. (1992). ***Canadian child care in context: Perspectives from the provinces and territories***. This two volume series provides an individual report for each province and territory. Each report includes the following sections: a) a demographic and economic overview of the province/territory; b) an historical overview of child care in the province/territory; c) an overview of the child care legislation in the province/territory, funding, and enrolments; and d) a bibliography of child care publications for the province/territory. In addition, for each province there is a presentation of the National Survey data (it was not possible to collect Survey data in the territories given Statistics Canada collection methodology).

Goelman, H., Pence, A.R., Lero, D.S., Brockman, L.M., Glick, N., & Berkowitz, J. (1993). ***Where are the children? An overview of child care arrangements in Canada*** and ***Where are the children? An analysis of child care arrangements used while parents work or study*** (expected, 1994). These two reports provide a complementary analysis of the child care arrangements used for children of different ages and the reasons for which children are in child care. Information is included on: a) child characteristics; b) child care characteristics; c) family characteristics; d) how parents searched for child care; and e) parents' satisfaction with their child care arrangement.

Lero, D.S., Brockman, L.M., Pence, A.R., Goelman, H., & Johnson, K.L. (1993). ***Work place benefits and flexibility: A perspective on parents' experiences.*** This report provides information on the availability of workplace benefits and practices that can help parents balance their family and work responsibilities. The benefits and practices examined include: a) workplace child care; b) flexibility in work hours; c) paid family responsibility leave; and d) options to work part time or job share.

Patterns of child care in one- and two-parent families (expected 1994) and ***Stay-at-home parents: An option for Canadian families*** (expected 1994). These two parallel reports provide a demographic description of each family type, compare family types in terms of specific child care issues, and address issues that are unique to each family type.

Lero, D.S., & Johnson, K.L. (in press). **110 Canadian statistics on work and family**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

The purpose of this document is to provide a compendium of recent Canadian statistics on work and family that will provide background information to assist in the development and implementation of policies, programs and workplace practices. This document is divided into the following eight major sections: a) changes in the paid labour force; b) changes in the family; c) family responsibilities and dependant-care needs; d) stress at home and in the workplace; e) child care; f) public policies and protections for employees with family responsibilities; g) employer support for employees with family responsibilities; and h) attitudes, perceptions, and public opinion.

Each section begins with a brief introduction followed by key statistics and citations for additional reading. A subject index is included at the end of the document.

The first three sections provide background information helpful for interpreting the research findings reported in the second part of the document. These three sections include: a) statistics showing the increased number of women in the paid labour force, the increased labour force participation of women with young children, the greater tendency for women rather than men to work part-time or in temporary jobs, and gender differences in rate of unionization, salaries, and participation in unpaid household work and child care; b) information about recent changes in family life such as increased birth rates, a trend towards women having their first child later in life, increased rate of births to single women, increased rate of dual-earner families and increased rate of lone-parent families (most of which are headed by women); and c) information about the increase in the elderly population and the implications of this demographic fact.

The final five sections report on the findings of recent surveys and studies on work and family issues. Each section provides a brief summary of the research findings relevant to the topic in question and complete citations for each report whose data was used. The section on child care provides information on the number of licensed child-care spaces, the number of latch-key children, and family expenditures on child care.

Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care. (1993). ***A child care agenda for the 90's: Putting the pieces together***. Proceedings from a national child care conference sponsored by the Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada and the Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care, Ottawa, October 15-19, 1992. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care.

This document includes the following five papers which were prepared as background papers and circulated to the conference participants prior to the conference.

Beach, J. (1992). ***A comprehensive system of child care***.

This paper includes: a) an overview of the current picture of child care in Canada including a discussion of child care availability in general and its relationship to the needs of working parents; b) an identification of the roles of the federal and provincial/territorial governments; c) a discussion of what is included in a comprehensive child care system; and d) an example of comprehensive child care services as developed by one community in Ontario.

Bertrand, J. (1992). ***Caring for children***.

This paper includes: a) an identification of the factors which determine the quality of the interaction between children and staff; b) a profile of the salaries, benefits and working conditions of staff in regulated child care centres; c) an identification of the educational requirements in the various provinces and territories; d) information about the current monitoring and enforcement practices across Canada; and e) suggestions for improving salaries, defining appropriate staff qualifications for different types of child care settings, and ensuring accountability for quality child care.

Cameron, B. (1992). ***Structure and management***.

This paper discusses the following: a) the philosophical and practical implications of treating child care as a private commodity to be purchased at the going rate on the market rather than treating it as a public service like public school education; b) system design issues that would arise if child care were treated as a public good rather than a private commodity, for example, distribution of public funding, the role of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

private sector, parental fees, regulation, accountability; c) the current roles and responsibilities of the federal government and of the provincial/territorial governments in the provision of social services; and d) suggested appropriate roles for the federal and for the provincial/territorial governments in a national child care system.

Friendly, M. (1992). ***Child care in a public policy context***.

This paper includes: a) a discussion of the main policy issues related to child care and child poverty including a description of the current situation in Canada; b) analysis of the impact of federal policies on children, child care as an essential component of a strategy to fight child poverty, and what is needed to make child care part of a strategy in the fight against child poverty; c) a discussion of child care as part of an economic strategy, including a description of the current situation regarding labour force needs, a rationale for including child care as part of a national economic strategy, and an identification of the elements required to make child care part of such a strategy; d) consideration of child care in the context of constitutional reform; and e) a discussion of options.

Oloman, M. (1992). ***Child care funding***.

This paper includes: a) a survey of current provincial and territorial child care funding programs, including information on child care subsidies and financial assistance for the operation of child care programs; b) a survey of current federal child care funding programs and policies, including information about the Canada Assistance Plan, income tax provisions, the Child Care Initiatives Fund, funding for on-reserve programs, and parental leave policies; and c) a review of practice in other countries. There is also a summary of previous major recommendations for change in funding arrangements and suggestions for funding a comprehensive national system of child care in Canada.

Friendly, M., Rothman, L., & Oloman, M. (1993). **Child care for Canadian children and families**. Occasional paper No. 1. Originally published as a background paper for a national symposium, *Canada's Children: Priority for the 90's*. Ottawa, October 27-29, 1991. Child Welfare League of America/Canada. Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This paper includes: a) a discussion of the changing needs of Canadian families and a description of current child care options; b) an identification of the current problems, including the lack of a comprehensive system of child care, the lack of child care availability, the high cost of child care, and the lack of adequate standards and regulation of child care; c) identification of federal policies and their weakness; and d) recommendations for the future.

National Strategy on Child Care

The following annotations relate to the federal government's National Strategy on Child Care, which was announced in December, 1987. This included substantially enhanced child care income tax measures which were implemented in 1989, the Child Care Initiatives Fund (a time-limited seven-year fund begun in 1988 to fund child care research projects and develop innovative child care services), and proposed legislation, the *Canada Child Care Act* (Bill C-144). Following Legislative Committee hearings at which all the submissions opposed the legislation, Bill C-144 died in the Senate on the eve of the federal election of 1988. The annotations are

presented in chronological order beginning in 1987 with the announcement of the Strategy and ending in 1988 with the publication of the National Council of Welfare's report proposing an alternative policy. Included are selected briefs presented at the Legislative Committee hearings on Bill C-144 and a 1989 annotation (Phillips) which provides a contextual overview.

Health and Welfare Canada. (1987). **National Strategy on Child Care**. Ottawa, Ontario: Health and Welfare Canada.

This information package describes the three components of the National Strategy on child care, namely: a) increased tax breaks for child care users and parents caring for their children at home or using unregulated care and not having receipts; b) time-limited funding for research and demonstration projects (the Child Care Initiatives Fund); and c) a seven-year plan for a federal-provincial cost-sharing arrangement to replace the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan and intended to fund 200,000 new child care spaces. (The enabling legislation for this new cost-sharing agreement, the *Canada Child Care Act*, was never passed.)

Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association. (1988). **A real Canadian Child Care Act: A reality or still an illusive dream**. A brief to the Legislative Committee on Bill C-144. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association (now the Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada).

In this brief, the Association reiterates its position that specific national objectives and funding criteria are required in any national child care financing plan. It points out that the proposed legislation would not fulfil the criteria in the Bill's preamble, that is, "to improve the availability, affordability, quality, and accessibility of child care services" nor would it meet the current or future needs of Canadian families.

Canadian Labour Congress. (1988). **A brief to the Legislative Committee on Bill C-144**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Labour Congress.

In this brief, the Canadian Labour Congress expresses its belief that the federal government has a responsibility to create a universally accessible, high quality, non-profit national child care system and that neither the National Strategy nor the proposed legislation would develop such a system. The brief describes the elements of the framework that the Congress believes is necessary to establish the type of child care system required and offers suggestions for amendments to the proposed legislation to enable it to meet the goals of availability, affordability, quality and accessibility of child care.

National Anti-Poverty Organization. (1988). **A brief to the Legislative Committee on Bill C-144: The Canada Child Care Act**. Ottawa, Ontario: National Anti-Poverty Organization.

In this brief, the National Anti-Poverty Organization notes that the proposed child care tax measures disproportionately benefit higher income families and are of no benefit to low income families who pay no or little income tax. In addition, these families rely heavily on the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan for assistance in meeting their child care needs and would be adversely effected by the proposed new federal-provincial cost sharing agreement.

National Council of Welfare. (1988). **Child care: A better alternative**. Ottawa, Ontario: Supply and Services, Canada.

This report: a) notes that the tax provisions proposed in the National Strategy on Child Care benefit upper income earners and will divert money away from the development of licensed child care services; b) expresses concern about the proposed ceiling on federal expenditures for child care programs; c) objects to funding for-profit child care services; d) recommends the expansion of paid parental leave provisions; e) recommends the allocation of more funds than suggested in order to provide for the development of 750,000 new child care places; and f) presents an alternative plan for the development of an affordable, high quality, non-profit child care system which includes elimination of all tax breaks and the implementation of a sliding fee scale.

Phillips, S.D. (1989). **Rock-a-bye Brian: The National Strategy on Child Care.** In K.S. Graham (Ed.), *How Ottawa spends: The buck stops where?* (Chapter 7, pp. 165-208). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

This chapter argues that the National Strategy on Child Care illustrates the Conservative government's approach to social programs in its extensive use of the tax system to distribute funds, its basis in the belief in a free market system, its avoidance of perceived or actual interference in matters of provincial jurisdiction, and its move away from the open-ended funding provisions which were characteristic of the Canada Assistance Plan at the time. Phillips traces the process leading to the proposed National Strategy and some of the reasons why it was uniformly rejected by child care advocacy and related groups. There is also a detailed analysis of the proposed delivery of the National Strategy through a combination of tax expenditures under personal income tax and direct spending under cost-sharing arrangements with the provincial/territorial governments. This analysis includes an identification of the weaknesses of the proposal to increase the Child Tax Credit and the Child Care Expense Deduction within the context of improved access to child care and a discussion of the impact of limiting expenditures under the Canada Assistance Plan on the provinces.

Special Committee on Child Care

The mandate of this Committee, which was established by the Conservative federal government in 1985, was to "examine and report on the child care needs of the Canadian family" and to include consideration of issues such as the needs of children, parents' views, the role of the federal government, the role of other levels of government, and the role of the voluntary sector. The Committee was composed of seven parliamentarians, five Conservatives, one Liberal, and one New Democrat. It held public hearings in 31 centres across Canada, received written submissions, and commissioned a number of research projects. The Committee's final report, *Sharing the Responsibility*, was tabled in March, 1987.

Note: ■ The complete transcripts of the public hearings held by this Committee are published as *Minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Special Committee on Child Care, Issues 1-51.* (1986). First session of the 33rd Parliament.

Special Committee on Child Care. (1987). **Sharing the responsibility**. Final report. Ottawa, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Canada.

Note: ■ This report represents the position of the five Conservative members of the Committee. The Liberal member and the New Democratic member each issued reports containing dissenting opinions (see Pépin (1987) and Mitchell (1987), annotated below).

The major recommendations of this report are: a) modification of the maternity leave benefits to a six-month benefit which could be used solely by the mother or shared between the parents; b) changing the existing Child Care Expense Deduction to a tax credit, worth up to $900 for parents with receioted expenses and $200 for all other parents; c) modest capital and operating grants which would be available to both for-profit and non-profit child care programs; and d) retention of the child care provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP).

Mitchell, M. (1987). **Caring for Canada's children: A special report on the crisis in child care**. Minority report of the New Democratic Party member of the Special Committee on Child Care. Ottawa, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Canada.

This minority report suggests that child care must be developed within a broader framework of family policy which recognizes that the well-being of children is not just a responsibility of their parents but also a responsibility of the society as a whole. It recommends: the federal funding of initiatives beyond the Canada Assistance Plan and income tax benefits to enable the development of a comprehensive system of child care services including licensed full- and half-day programs, supervised family day care, emergency and relief care, child care for children with special needs, and options for parents who work shifts. The report also recommends extended maternity and parental leave benefits and that new funding arrangements should be directed to non-profit programs.

Pépin, L. (1987). **Choices for child care: Now and the future**. Minority report of the Liberal Party member of the Special Committee on Child Care. Ottawa, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Canada.

This minority report begins with an historical review of the development of child care in Canada and the federal government's role. It then discusses the principles upon which a child care system should be developed. The report recommends: a) amendments to the Canada Assistance Plan to make subsidies more available to low-income families; b) the introduction of variable cost-sharing arrangements in order to improve the funding of child care in the poorer provinces; c) immediate introduction of a National Child Care Foundation to channel federal funds and support the development of non-profit child care; and d) the introduction of a National Child Care Act to fund child care based on an equitable sharing of costs between the government, parents, and employers.

Friendly, M., Mathien, J., & Willis, T. (1987). **Child care - What the public said**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association.

This report presents a content analysis of the minutes of the proceedings of the public hearings held across Canada by the Special Committee on Child Care in 1986. According to the analysis, a majority of respondents said that: a) child care can be beneficial to children and families; b) a comprehensive child care system should be developed in Canada; c) child care services should be available to all Canadian families, be supported by direct government funding, and have parents pay fees; and d) public funds should only be used for the development of non-profit programs. A minority of respondents said that: a) child care was harmful to children or families; b) government funds should be paid directly to parents through a tax credit or voucher; c) child care

should be a service targeted to certain families rather than a service for all families; and d) for-profit child care should be supported by the government or included in the child care system.

The following research and/or review reports were prepared for the Special Committee on Child Care.

Cameron, V. (1986). **The benefit-costs of preschool child care programs: A critical review.**

Cleveland, G. (1987). **Provincial day care subsidy systems in Canada.**

Gunderson, M. (1987). **Implications of daycare policies on female labour market behaviour.**

E.E. Hobbs and Associates Ltd. (1987). **Child care fees: The financial squeeze on families.**

E.E. Hobbs and Associates Ltd. (1987). **Review of child care fees.**

Kuiken, J. (1987). **Latchkey children.**

Lalonde-Graton, M. (1987). **Child care in Québec: An overview.** (Annotated in Section 2, Family Policy and Child Care: The provinces and territories).

Mock, K. (1987). **Child care needs of cultural minorities.** (An article based on this paper is annotated in Section 18, Multicultural child care).

SPR Associates. (1987). **An exploratory review of selected issues in for-profit versus not-for-profit child care.**

SPR Associates. (1987). **A national review of child care arrangements in the workplace.**

Task Force on Child Care

The Task Force on Child Care was appointed by the Liberal federal government in May, 1984 and headed by Dr. Katie Cooke. Its mandate was to examine the need for child care services and parental leave in Canada and to make recommendations to the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women. The Task Force's findings and recommendations were intended to be used as background material for the development of a national child care policy. The Task Force report was submitted in March, 1986 to the Conservative government which was elected in 1984. Before receiving the Task Force's recommendations, the new Conservative government appointed the Special Committee on Child Care (see the above section).

Cooke, K., London, J., Rose-Lizée, R., & Edwards, R. (1986). **Report of the Task Force on Child Care.** Ottawa, Ontario: Status of Women, Canada.

Part I of the Report is a description of the current child care situation in Canada, including information about family dynamics, existing support systems for working parents, and the extent to which present child care services meet the needs. Part II compares Canada's child care with Canada's education and health services and with child care services in other countries. Part III sets out the Task Force's recommendations. These

include: a) the development, over 15 years, of a publicly funded, universally accessible national system of licensed group and family day care programs which recognise the wide variety of child care needs experienced by Canadian families; b) the use of government funds only for government-run and non-profit services; c) expansion of parental leave provisions; d) the development of complementary parental leave and child care systems; and e) a division of roles and responsibilities among the three levels of government (federal, provincial, and municipal). The report also outlines the potential costs and expected benefits of its recommendations.

The following papers were prepared as background materials for the Task Force on Child Care.

Series 1: Financing child care: Current arrangements

Blain, C. (1985). **Government spending on child care in Canada**.

Brown, M., & Power, D. (1985). **Child care and taxation in Canada: Who pays?**

Schom-Moffat, P. (1985). **The bottom line: Wages and working conditions of workers in the formal day care market**. (A more recent study on the same subject is annotated in Section 11, The Adult Work Environment).

Thomson, T. (1985). **Municipal initiatives in child care**.

Townson, M. (1985). **Financing child care through the Canada Assistance Plan**. Annotated in this section.

Series 2: Financing child care: Future arrangements

DPA Group. (1985). **National day care costing model**.

Miller-Chenier, N., & LaBarge, D. (1985). **Towards universality: An historical overview of the evolution of education, health care, day care and maternity leave**.

Rose-Lizée, R. (1985). **A proposal to cost-share operating and start-up grants to day-care centres: Ten year estimate of the impact on day-care spaces, percentage of need met, salaries, user fees, employment and federal expenditures**.

Stotsky, K. (1985). **An overview of some federal-provincial fiscal arrangements and proposed options for financing a system of child care in Canada**.

Tienhaara, N. (1985). **Job creation in the child care industry**.

Series 3: Child care: Standards and quality

Blais-Bates, H. (1985). **Day care standards in Canada**. Annotated in this section.

Esbensen, S. (1985). **The effects of day care on children, families and communities: A review of the research literature**. (For additional information on the effects of child care on children see Section 6, The Effects of Child Care).

Lero, D., & Kyle, I. (1985). **Day care quality: Its definition and implementation**. (For additional information on quality see Section 8, Quality).

Miller-Chenier, N. (1985). **The informal child care market: Public policy for private homes**.

Thomson, T. (1985). **Enforcement of provincial day care standards**.

Series 4: Child care: The employer's role.

Rothman-Beach Associates. (1985). **A study of work-related day care in Canada**. (For additional information on the employer's role in child care see Section 16, Work-related child care).

Townson, M. (1985). **Paid parental leave policies: An international comparison with options for Canada**.

Series 5: Child care needs of parents and families

Downie, P. (1985). **Child care needs of immigrants**. (Also see Section 18, Multicultural Child Care).

Lero, D., Pence, A., Brockman, L., & Charlesworth, M. (1985). **Parents' needs, preferences, and concerns about child care: Case studies of 336 Canadian families**. (A more recent study, the Canadian National Child Care Study, is cited on page 2.)

Series 6: A Bibliography of Canadian Day Care Research

Pence, A. (1985). **A bibliography of Canadian day care research**.

Blais-Bates, H. (1985). **Day care standards in Canada**. A report prepared for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 3, Ottawa, Ontario: Status of Women, Canada.

This report describes the legislation, summarizes some of the significant features of standards, and outlines the regulations for each province and territory. This includes the different definitions used in the various jurisdictions. The report also discusses the concept of regulation and the extent to which licensing can guarantee quality.

Note: ■ Some changes have occurred in actual regulations since this report was written (see the following section). However, its discussion of the rationale, purpose, and process of standard setting continues to be relevant.

Townson, M. (1985). **Financing child care through the Canada Assistance Plan**. A report prepared for the Task Force on Child Care, Series 1, Ottawa, Ontario: Status of Women, Canada.

This report notes that the Canada Assistance Plan is not intended to fund child care. Instead, its purpose is to allow federal-provincial cost-sharing of services to alleviate or prevent poverty. Funds disbursed by the provinces and territories under this arrangement are used to subsidize child care for low income families. The author argues that this has not been a successful mechanism for two reasons. First of all, by definition, CAP is not designed to develop universal social services. Therefore, funding under CAP is restrictive and inflexible. Secondly, the provinces have the right to set the levels for families' eligibility and these levels vary from province to province. The report includes information on how CAP functions and the specifics of how the cost of child care services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are shared by the provincial and federal government. It also discusses the policy issues raised by the current arrangement.

Note: ■ Apart from a federal ceiling on cost-sharing under CAP for some provinces implemented in 1990, the arrangement described is still in existence. Therefore, the identification of problems and issues remains relevant.

See also

Lero, D., & Brockman, L. (1993). **Single parent families in Canada: A closer look**. In J. Hudson and B. Gallaway (Eds.), *Single parent families: Perspectives on research and policy*. Toronto, Ontario: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc. (Annotated in Section 3, Child Care and the Broader Social Context.)

SECTION 2: FAMILY POLICY AND CHILD CARE: THE PROVINCES AND TERRITORIES

Introduction

The previous section provided citations related to the federal government's role in child care. This section is divided as follows:

- **Documents specific to a particular province or territory**: provides annotations related to provincial/territorial roles, responsibilities, policies and practices. Where provincial/territorial government and/or child care association documents related to family policy or child care exist, a citation and annotation is provided for the most recent document(s).
- **Documents which provide information on each province and territory**: provides annotations for four survey documents which provide information about each province and territory.
- **List of the government offices responsible for child care and key provincial/territorial child care associations**: contains addresses for the government office responsible for child care in each jurisdiction and for local child care associations. These are given to assist people seeking an update on the current status of a provincial or territorial policy.

It should be noted that there is some overlap in content between this section and the previous section. Therefore, the user of this annotated bibliography is advised to review both sections.

Documents specific to a particular province or territory

The provinces are listed from east to west with the territories following. Policy documents from Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and the Northwest Territories were not available.

NEW BRUNSWICK

New Brunswick Advisory Council on the Status of Women. (1989). **Office of childhood services: General orientation**. Moncton, New Brunswick: Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

This report, written by an independent body, provides advice to the provincial government which: a) discusses the lack of sufficient regulated child care places to meet the need in New Brunswick and the consequences of this situation; b) proposes some guiding principles for the development of a child care system in the province; c) identifies the need to develop policies and standards; d) addresses the issues of accessibility, diversity, funding, staff training and support, and staff wages and working conditions; and e) proposes that the provincial government take a leadership role in the circulation of research findings related to child care. The bibliography cites earlier related publications from New Brunswick.

NOVA SCOTIA

Nova Scotia Round Table on Day Care. (1991). **Report of the Round Table on Day Care in Nova Scotia**. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Nova Scotia Ministry of Community Services.

The Round Table was a government Task Force consisting of representatives from both the for-profit and non-profit sectors of the child care community, parents, and educators. Its purpose was: a) to determine a testing mechanism for the delivery of a salary enhancement grant to registered non-profit centres; b) to develop a strategy to assist the provincial government in negotiations with the federal government on behalf of the private sector; and c) to study and make recommendations regarding salaries, subsidized spaces, standards, and other issues it deemed relevant.

This report has 45 recommendations, including recommendations for: a) basing salary levels on a combination of the worker's educational level and the worker's role, that is, frontline worker, supervisor, or director; b) the formation of a permanent child care advisory board to the government; c) an increase in the number of subsidized spaces; d) additional government licensing and enforcement staff; e) an information package on government requirements for centres and family day care providers; f) revision of the current legislation to reduce the number of children per caregiver; and g) the establishment of a committee to examine staff training and certification. There are also sections which address current issues with regard to federal/provincial funding, the role of municipalities, and family day care.

Child Care Connection - NS. (1991). **Working together: N.S. child care talks about: N.S. Day Care Act and Regulations, subsidized seats and salaries**. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Child Care Connection - NS.

This report, which is a response to the above Round Table report, indicates some concerns about the cost impact of reducing the number of children per caregiver, provides suggestions for equitable salary levels based on educational level, and provides suggestions for the implementation of an additional number of subsidized places.

Note: ■ This report is based on a workshop discussion. Generally, less than ten responses are provided for each of the three issues discussed.

QUÉBEC

Québec Secrétariat à la famille. (1989). **Putting families first: Plan of action respecting family policy 1989-1991**. Québec City, Québec: Ministère de la santé et des services sociaux.

This document, specifically identified as a plan of action, reviews recent changes in family structure and roles and emphasizes the need for government assistance to families. The main initiatives directly related to family support and child care are: a) continuing to increase financial assistance to families with several children, especially young children; b) introducing a leave of up to 52 weeks when a child is born, the first 18 weeks to be a maternity leave, the remainder for use by either parent; c) increasing adoption leave from two days to a maximum of 34 weeks which could be used by either parent; d) implementing an unpaid family responsibility leave of five days per year; e) encouraging businesses to adopt flexible work

schedules which may assist parents handle their family responsibilities; f) creating additional child care spaces; g) enhancing direct assistance to parents to pay for child care; h) providing assistance for child care staff training and professional development; i) increasing assistance to facilitate integration of children with handicaps; and j) encouraging prevention in the health and social service fields. There are also a number of initiatives related to addressing family violence, the needs of minority groups, and the housing needs of low income and/or large families.

L'Office des services de garde à l'enfance, Québec. (1988). **Policy statement on day care services: A better balance**. Québec City, Québec: L'Office des services de garde à l'enfance.

This paper outlines the specifics of the government's commitment to a five-year expansion plan to improve parents' access to high quality, affordable child care. It proposes a doubling of the number of licensed child care spaces to 130,000 by 1994. In addition, special emphasis will be placed on the development of specifically needed services such as workplace centres, agency-coordinated family day care, services for school-age children, flexible services to meet different regional and cultural needs, and a variety of short-term child care options. There is also information provided about child care funding, including tables on fees and government assistance to families.

Lalonde-Graton, M. (1987). **Child care in Québec: An overview**. Paper prepared for the Special Committee on Child Care, Ottawa, Ontario.

This report provides: a) a brief history of the various measures adopted by the government in Québec in regard to child care services up to the proclamation of the *Child Day Care Act* in 1980 and the establishment of the Office des services de garde à l'enfance; b) a discussion of the most important provisions of the legislation and the powers invested in the Office des services de garde à l'enfance; c) information about funding, including parent subsidization; d) a discussion of the different types of child care in the province; e) an explanation of the underlying philosophy of the child care system, including its emphasis on parent involvement in centre decision-making; and f) an identification of issues to be addressed; therefore, a review of parental contributions and a review of the role of municipalities. The information about tying government grant eligibility to having parents as a majority of the centre board of directors, the on-going debate in the province regarding for-profit child care, the licensing of family day care, and the legislative requirements for parent involvement are of particular interest from a policy point of view.

ONTARIO

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1992). **Setting the stage: A public consultation paper**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This consultation paper notes that child care is evolving from a welfare service to an essential public service, thus, reform of the child care system is necessary. It suggests the following four principles: a) quality is the cornerstone of the child care system; b) child care services must be affordable; c) child care services must be accessible; and d) the child care system must be soundly managed. Each of these

principles is described. There is also a discussion of the concept of child care as an essential public service and the government's commitment to direct public funds only to publicly-accountable non-profit services. The key components proposed for the reform are: a) a new management structure which clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities of the provincial and municipal governments and the relationship between them; b) funding directed solely to non-profit programs but with an interim period during which the government will assist for-profit services to convert to non-profit status; c) the promotion of quality through: creating standards that focus on measures of quality, the promotion of staff training, directly funding only those services which are regulated, expanding the network of child and family resource centres as a means of supporting quality in informal child care arrangements, and providing parents and the public with information about child care and child development; d) making child care more affordable through: providing base funding to non-profit centres and regulated family day care programs, providing a fairer distribution of funds across the province, developing a new way of determining parental contributions, and maximizing cost-sharing with the federal government; e) making child care more accessible by: developing a comprehensive system that will serve children up to age 12, ensuring access across the province (which implies paying particular attention to northern and rural areas), strengthening the links between child care services and other programs for children and families, and continuing to provide base funding for child care resource centres; and f) improving management of the child care system by: clearly defining provincial and local responsibilities, continuing to provide provincial leadership, developing local management capabilities, and ensuring that responsibility for the allocation of funds is tied to other management responsibilities such as planning and monitoring.

Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care. (1992). **On the road to reform**. A response to *Child care reform in Ontario: Setting the stage, A public consultation paper.* Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care.

This response to the government consultation paper, annotated above, is based on two full days of debates among Coalition members and feedback from twelve public meetings held throughout the province. It contains the following sections: a) an explanation of why all families and children should have access to appropriate, high quality child care services; b) a brief history of the attempts at child care reform in Ontario from 1981 to the present; c) an identification of current problems, such as affordability, lack of sufficient licensed places, inconsistent quality across child care settings, and the continuation of a welfare approach to child care funding; d) a reaction to the consultation paper; and e) specific recommendations and a timetable for child care reform. The Coalition supports the government consultation paper as a good first step towards the development of a child care system. The Coalition makes twelve recommendations which focus on: a) the need for legislative reform; b) the need for full base funding for child care services; c) the need to re-examine the current funding mechanisms; d) the need for a full range of child care and related services, such as family resource centres, and for services sensitive to the needs of aboriginal people, rural communities, and children with special needs; e) improvement in staff training, salaries and benefits; f) the need for a new management structure; and g) strengthening of parental and family responsibility leave.

Lero, D., & Kyle, I. (1989). **Families and children in Ontario: Supporting the parenting role**. Toronto, Ontario: Child, Youth and Family Research Centre.

This paper was written shortly after the Ontario Liberal government's 1987 policy statement *New Directions for Child Care* (which it critiques) but before the New Democratic Party's consultation paper, *Setting the Stage*, was released in 1992. This paper provides: a) a demographic portrait of Ontario's families which emphasizes changing needs; b) discusses some of the fundamental issues underlying the development and implementation of family policy and suggests why Canada has no national family policy; c) describes the problems in reconciling work and family life; and d) describes the status of child care services in Ontario at that time. The discussion of the situation in Ontario includes: a) information about the legislation; b) enrolment figures; c) financial information; d) a summary of key federal/provincial positions from 1942 to 1989; and e) a critique of the proposed policies in *New Directions for Child Care* as too timid.

MANITOBA

Manitoba Child Care Association Inc. (1989). **Share the challenge**. Presentation to the Manitoba Day Care Task Force. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Child Care Association Inc.

This presentation to a government-appointed Task Force: a) discusses the role of parents, care providers, the federal government and the provincial government in the provision of quality child care; b) provides a rationale for its recommendation that government funding go only to non-profit programs; c) discusses what is required for the provision of quality infant/toddler and school-age care; and d) identifies some reasons for the current low salary and benefits levels for child care workers. The report recommends that the government: a) increase funding to non-profit programs; b) double its salary enhancement grants; c) join with the Association to develop a province-wide salary scale; d) provide funding and resources to enhance parent boards; e) require all non-profit administered boards to have a minimum of 50% parent membership; f) provide low interest loans or capital grants to assist non-profit centres with renovation or relocation.

Manitoba Child Care Task Force. (1989). **The report of the Manitoba Child Care Task Force**. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Child Care Task Force.

This Task Force discusses the roles of parents, providers, the federal government, the provincial government, and the community in the provision of child care. There is also an identification of what is required to provide quality care, including adequate staff training, adequate salaries and benefits, a partnership between parents and providers and governments, and standards which are enforced. There are 204 recommendations under the following broad headings: a) staff training and certification in regard to both centre-based and family day care and training for boards of directors; b) standards, regulations and licensing; c) public education to assist parents to be informed consumers; d) a broader consultation role for the government's Child Day Care Office; e) infant child care; f) school-age child care; g) child care services for children with special needs; h) development of a range of options, including part-time care and work site care; i) financial management and controls; j) family day care; k) rural child care; l) aboriginal child care. The priority recommendations are identified as those related to salaries, training, financial support for the present system, and the provision of additional spaces.

SASKATCHEWAN

Saskatchewan Child Care Association. (1989). **The child care story: The struggle, the reality, the vision**. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Saskatchewan Child Care Association.

This report includes: a) a profile of child care in Saskatchewan, including a comparison of per capita enrolment in child care versus enrolment in other provinces; b) information about government funding and subsidization of parent fees; c) information about Saskatchewan's standards and regulations; d) a comparison of Saskatchewan's licensing standards with those in other provinces; e) a section describing some innovative programs in Saskatchewan; and f) a discussion of key issues to be addressed, such as rural child care.

ALBERTA

Alberta Family and Social Services. (1990). **Meeting the need: A fairer, better system for Albertans: A White Paper on reforms to Alberta's day care program**. Calgary, Alberta: Alberta Family and Social Services.

This government White Paper proposes some significant changes in Alberta's child care system. These include: a) reductions in operating allowances; b) increases in subsidization for low income families; c) introduction of specific training requirements for child care staff (a two-year diploma in early childhood education for a centre director by 1993 and a one-year certificate in early childhood education for one in every six staff by 1991 and one in every four staff by 1993); and d) a reduction of staff:child ratios for infants from 1:3 to 1:4.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

British Columbia Ministry of Women's Equality. (1992). **Child care: A community partnership**. Victoria, British Columbia: British Columbia Ministry of Women's Equality.

This document specifies the steps taken or to be taken by the provincial government in response to the recommendations of the Task Force on Child Care (see the following annotation). In addition to having identified a lead Ministry and creating a Child Care Development Branch within that Ministry, the government also proposes a provincial child care council, composed of community representatives and given a mandate to provide independent and expert advice to the government, and the development of local community child care planning bodies. Other proposals in this document are: a) quality enhancement grants; b) increased subsidization rates for families in need; c) incentive grants to increase the availability of infant and toddler spaces; d) expansion of the grants program to help non-profit services with funding for repairs, relocation and start-up costs; e) increased support for unregulated care providers; f) legislative amendments; g) task forces or committees to examine: aboriginal child care, child care for children with special needs, and ways to improve care provider salaries; h) training incentives and increased availability of training; and i) an increase in the number of licensing officers, in part to enable them to provide more consultation.

British Columbia Task Force on Child Care. (1991). **Showing we care: A child care strategy for the 90's**. Victoria, British Columbia: British Columbia Minister Responsible for Women's Programs.

This document begins with a review of the changing needs of families and the way in which child care was delivered and supported in British Columbia in 1991. It suggests that an accessible, affordable, quality and comprehensive system be developed that would support parents and ensure that they have options, including the option to remain at home to care for their children. The following four principles are put forward as the basis for a new system: a) that the health and well-being of the child are of paramount importance; b) that the provision of quality child care is a family issue and is required to meet society's needs; c) that the responsibility for the provision of child care is shared between parents, caregivers, the community and all levels of government; and d) that parents have the responsibility and right to choose the type of care that best suits their family needs. The report makes 56 recommendations. These include: a) that the government accept that it is responsible to develop, deliver, and coordinate an adequately funded, comprehensive, high quality child care system that is accessible and affordable to all families; b) that a board or commission of community representatives be created to provide advice to a lead Ministry; c) that the government enshrine its child care mandate and delivery system in legislation; d) that the government develop community planning bodies; e) that a working committee on aboriginal child care be established; f) that models be developed and implemented to provide support services for regulated and unregulated family day care providers; g) 18 recommendations related to improved funding; h) seven recommendations related to training and provider compensation; i) that the government increase the number of licensing officers; and j) 12 recommendations related to creating new partnerships or strengthening existing ones.

YUKON TERRITORY

Yukon Ministry of Health and Human Resources. (1988). **Let's talk about child care in the Yukon: A green paper**. Whitehorse, Yukon: Yukon Ministry of Health and Human Resources.

Child Care Consultation Panel to the Minister of Health and Human Resources. (1988). **We care: Yukoners talk about child care**. Whitehorse, Yukon: Yukon Ministry of Health and Human Resources.

Yukon Ministry of Health and Human Resources. (1989). **Working together: A child care strategy for the Yukon**. Whitehorse, Yukon: Yukon Ministry of Health and Human Resources.

These three documents trace the development of a new child care policy for the Yukon. *Let's talk about child care in the Yukon* is a consultation paper which provides background information, identifies the policy issues to be addressed, and presents eight proposed principles to guide the future development of child care services.

We care: Yukoners talk about child care summarizes public reaction to the consultation paper and indicates strong support for the eight proposed principles. It also includes information about the availability of child care and issues that were raised during public meetings.

Working together: A child care strategy for the Yukon was the New Democratic Party government's response to the consultation process. It states the government's commitment to provide a quality, affordable and comprehensive child care system and describes a four-year plan to improve child care services. This includes: a) improved capital and operating grant programs; b) expansion of the subsidy system; c) increased services for children with special needs; d) improved training for child care staff; e) the establishment of a Child Care Services Unit within the Ministry of Health and Human Resources; and f) the development of new legislation consistent with the eight principles and the announced commitments.

Documents which provide information on each province and territory

Childcare Resource and Research Unit. (1994). **Child care in Canada: Provinces and territories 1993**. Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

The following information for each province and territory is included: funding mechanisms, number of children, number of children with disabilities, number of aboriginal children, number of children with a mother in the paid labour force, the models of child care available in the jurisdiction, standards and regulations, number of spaces, average wages, average monthly fees, monitoring and enforcement and the recent developments for each province where available. Cross-Canada tables summarize per capita expenditures on child care, proportions of children covered in regulated child care, aboriginal child care, ratios, group sizes, types of child care, training requirements, etc. Twenty-one summary tables are provided as well as material on each province and territory.

Pence, A. (Coordinating editor). (1992). **Canadian child care in context: Perspectives from the provinces and territories, Volume I & II**. Report from the Canadian National Child Care Study. Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada and Health and Welfare Canada.

This two volume series provides an individual report for each province and territory. Each report includes the following sections: a) a demographic and economic overview of the province/territory; b) an historical overview of child care in the province/territory; c) an overview of the child care legislation in the province/territory, funding, and enrolments; and d) a bibliography of child care publications. In addition, for each province there is a presentation of the National Survey data from 1988 (it was not possible to collect Survey data in the territories given Statistics Canada collection methodology). Volume I covers Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and the Yukon. Volume II covers New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, the Northwest Territories, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec.

Norpark Computer Design Inc. (1991). **A comparative analysis of child care legislation**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This report, based on telephone interviews, compares the provinces and territories on the following dimensions: a) the philosophy behind the child care legislation; b) the perceived role of the provincial government in the provision of child care; c) the types of child care available; d) provisions for special

groups such as aboriginal children; e) the way in which staffing issues are addressed; f) methods for attempting to ensure quality; and i) funding for both users and programs.

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1990). **Description of child care training programs in Canadian and international jurisdictions**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This report provides an overview of the legislation and a description of training programs for staff for each province and territory plus Sweden, France, and the United Kingdom.

List of the government offices responsible for child care and key provincial/ territorial child care associations

The address and telephone number for the government contact in each province/territory is provided first, then the names and addresses of non-governmental provincial or territorial child care organizations are listed. It should be noted that the list of non-governmental organizations is not exhaustive.

NEWFOUNDLAND

Government

Day Care and Homemaker Services
Department of Social Services
West Block, Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland A1B 4J6

Vivian Randall, Director of Child Care
Tel: (709) 729-3590
Fax: (709) 729-0583

Non-government

Association of Early Childhood Educators
of Newfoundland and Labrador (AECENL)
P.O. Box 9713
St. John's, Newfoundland, AIA 4J7
Tel: (709) 753-6002

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Government

Early Childhood Services
Division of Special Services
Dept. of Health and Social Services
P.O. Box 2000
Charlottetown, P.E.I. C1A 7N8

Kathleen Rochon, Provincial Coordinator
Tel: (902) 368-4923
Fax: (902) 368-4969

Non-government

Early Childhood Development Association
of P.E.I.
West Royalty Industrial Park
Box 9
West Royalty, P.E.I. C1E 1B0
Tel: (902) 566-9620

NEW BRUNSWICK

Government

Office for Childhood Services
Dept. of Health and Community Services
P.O. Box 5100
Fredericton, New Brunswick E3B 5G8

Diane Lutes, Coordinator, Early Childhood
Services
Tel: (506) 855-4187
Fax: (506) 453-2082

Non-government

Early Childhood Coalition/
Coalition Petite Enfance
123 York Street, Suite 202
Fredericton, New Brunswick E3B 3N6
Tel: (506) 459-6755

NOVA SCOTIA

Government

Family and Children's Services
Department of Community Services
P.O. Box 696
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 2T7

Gregory Gammon, Director of Day Care Services
Tel: (902) 424-3204
Fax: (902) 424-0549

Non-government

Child Care Advocacy Association
of Nova Scotia
c/o South End Day Care
5594 Morris Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3J 1C2
Tel: (902) 420-1618

Child Care Connection - NS
Suite 100, 1200 Tower Road
Halifax, Nova Scotia B3H 4K6
Tel: (902) 432-8199

QUÉBEC

Government

L'office des services de garde à l'enfance
100, rue Sherbrook est
Montréal, PQ H2X 1C3

Nicole Marcotte, Président
Tel: (514) 873-2323
Fax: (514) 873-4250

Non-government

Association des services de garde en milieu scolaire du Québec inc.
1600, rue Bourassa
Longueuil, PQ J4J 3A4
Tel: (514) 646-2753

Association of Early Childhood Educators/
Association des éducateurs et éducatrices de la petite enfance
828 boul Décarie Blvd., #201
St-Laurent, PQ H4L 3L9
Tel: (514) 747-0519

Concertaction inter-régionale des garderies du Québec
14, rue Aberdeen
St-Lambert, PQ J4P 1R3
Tel: (514) 671-9131

Le regroupement des agences de services de garde en milieu familial du Québec
100-A, Rue Giguére
Lac Etchemin, Québec G0R 15O
Tel: (514) 625-3853

ONTARIO

Government

Child Care Branch
Ministry of Community and Social Services
2 Bloor Street, West, 30th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1E9

Richard Bradley, Director of Child Care
Tel: (416) 327-4855
Fax: (416) 327-0563

Non-government

Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care
500A Bloor Street West, 2nd floor
Toronto, Ontario M52 1Y8
Tel: (416) 538-0628
Tel: (416) 487-3157

Association of Early Childhood Educators, Ontario
40 Orchard View Blvd., Rm 211
Toronto, Ontario M4R 1B9
Tel: (416) 487-3157

Home Child Care Association of Ontario/
L'association des garderies familiales de l'Ontario
3101 Bathurst Street, Rm 303
Toronto, Ontario M6A 2A6
Tel: (416) 782-1152

MANITOBA

Government

Child Day Care
Department of Family Services
114 Gary Street, 2nd floor
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 1G1

Gisela Rempel, Director of Child Care
Tel: (204) 945-2668
Fax: (204) 873-0299

Non-government

Manitoba Child Care Association Inc.
364 McGregor Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba R2W 4X3
Tel: (284) 586-8587

SASKATCHEWAN

Government

Child Day Care Division
Department of Social Services
1920 Broad Street
Regina, Saskatchewan S4P 3V6

Deborah Bryck, Director of Child Care
Tel: (306) 787-3855
Fax: (306) 787-0925

Non-government

Saskatchewan Child Care Association
#1 -3002 Louise Street
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7J 3B8
Tel: (306) 664-4408

ALBERTA

Government

Alberta Family and Social Services
7th Street Plaza
10030-107th Street, 11th floor
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 3E4

Dennis Maier, Director, Day Care Programs
Tel: (403) 427-4477
Fax: (403) 427-2039

Non-government

Alberta Association for Young Children
7340-78th Street
Edmonton, Alberta T6C 2N1
Tel: (403) 465-1571

Early Childhood Professional Association of Alberta
P.O. Box 3631
Spruce Grove, Alberta T7X 3A9
Tel: (403) 276-6886

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Government contact

Ministry of Women's Equality
Child Care Branch
756 Fort Street
Victoria, B.C. V8V 1X4

Jane Beach, Director of Child Care
Tel: (604) 356-7960
Fax: (604) 356-6222

Non-government contact

British Columbia Daycare Action Coalition
201-1675 West 4th Avenue
Vancouver, B.C. V6J 1L8
Tel: (604) 876-8440

Early Childhood Educators of B.C.
3998 Main Street
Vancouver, B.C. V5V 3P2
Tel: (604) 739-3099

Westcoast Child Care Resource Centre
201-1675 West 4th Avenue
Vancouver, B.C. V6J 1L8
Tel: (604) 739-3099

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Government contact

Child Day Care Section
Dept. of Education, Culture & Employment
Lahm Ridge Tower, 1st floor
Government of the NWT
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, NWT X1A 2L9

Wendy White-Cserepy, Manager Decentralization
Training and Child Day Care Programs
Career Development Division
Tel: (403) 920-8780
Fax: (403) 873-0200

YUKON TERRITORY

Government contact

Child Services Unit
Dept. of Health & Social Services
P.O. Box 2703
Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 2C6

Debbie Mauch, Supervisor
Tel: (403) 667-3002
Fax: (403) 668-4613

Non-government contact

Yukon Child Care Association
Box 5439
Whitehorse, Yukon Y1A 5H4
Tel: (403) 668-2485

NATIONAL CONTACTS

Federal government contact

Child Care Programs, Human Resources Canada
1st Floor
Finance Building
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1B5

Ron Yzerman, Director
Tel: (613) 952-7975

Howard Clifford, National Advisor
Tel: (613) 954-8258

Cheryl Smith, National Day Care
Information Centre
Tel: (613) 957-0612
FAX: (613) 957-9562

Non-government contacts

Child Care Advocacy Association of Canada
323 Chapel Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7Z2

Jocelyne Tougas, Acting Executive Director
Tel: (613) 594-3196
Fax: (613) 594-9375

Canadian Child Care Federation
120 Holland Street, Suite 401
Ottawa, Ontario K1Y 0X6

Dianne Bascombe, Executive Director
Tel: (613) 729-5289
Fax: (613) 729-3159

SECTION 3: CHILD CARE AND THE BROADER SOCIAL CONTEXT

Introduction

Child care has been variously defined as a social welfare program, an early childhood development program, an employment issue, a women's problem or an issue related to gender equality. Child care is also a means of addressing child poverty since lack of affordable child care prevents single or poor parents from working. These ways of looking at child care recognize that it exists within a broader social context which includes changing family constellations and increased workforce participation by women.

It should be noted that there is some overlap between this section and Section 2. The user of this annotated bibliography who is interested in child care and/or family policy and how it is developed is advised to review the annotations in these two other sections as well.

Baker, M. (1993). **A sociological perspective on child care research**. In I. Kyle, M. Friendly, & L.Schmidt (Eds.), *Proceedings from the child care policy & research symposium*. Occasional paper No. 2 (pp. 37-48). Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This paper notes that child care research conducted by sociologists has tended to focus on: a) the reasons for the increased demand for child care; b) the strategies used by parents to balance work and family responsibilities and the consequences of the different strategies; and c) the division of labour within families, for example, responsibility for housework or taking care of the children. There is also a discussion of the connection between child care and family benefits, employment practices, and ideology. An extensive bibliography is provided to enable the reader to access the findings of the research cited by the author.

Hewlett, S.A. (1993). **Child neglect in rich nations.** New York: United Nations Children's Fund.

This report describes how and why some of the most affluent countries in the world neglect their children. It presents two very different approaches to policies for children: the "Anglo-American" model (characterized by market-driven policies and the privatizing of child rearing) and the supportive, western European model (where public policy has strengthened rather than weakened social safety nets for children). The author presents data about expenditures, taxes and transfers and trends as well as information on families and the stresses which affect their ability to raise children. Canada, together with the United States and Great Britain exemplify and illustrate the Anglo-American model while aspects of social policies for children in France, the Netherlands, Sweden and Belgium represent the European approach.

Ross, D. (Ed.). (1993). **Family security in insecure times.** Ottawa: National Forum on Family Security. (Available from the Canadian Council on Social Development.)

This collection of papers is concerned with the economic and social insecurity facing Canadian families. It is intended as beginning of an examination of family insecurity to be conducted over the next three years which will include a series of public forums, exploration of imaginative responses and a final statement scheduled for 1966.

The collection includes discussions of the threats to economic and social security, the causes of policy paralysis, globalization social/economic factors in human development, demographic change, women and family security and the myth of Canadian compassion. Contributors include economists, social policy analysts, sociologists, and others.

Pollard, J. (1993). **Ideology, social policy and home-based child care**. In I. Kyle, M. Friendly, & L. Schmidt (Eds.), *Proceedings from the child care policy & research symposium.* Occasional paper No. 2 (pp. 101-114). Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This paper discusses the relationships between three classical political ideologies of Western democracies (conservative, liberal, and socialist) and social policies related to responsibility for children. The first section identifies the position of each of the three ideologies in regard to factors such as individual rights, the role of government in social service provision, the extend of responsibility of the family and of the state for the welfare of children, and the boundaries between private and public responsibilities. The position of each ideology is then specifically related to the provision of family day care. Finally, the author also discusses what she terms an emergent non-traditional ideology which attempts to view social policy from the collective interests of parents, caregivers, and children.

Note: ■ The Proceedings document which includes this paper contains a commentary by Ruth Rose of the Université du Québec à Montréal. This commentary expands on the characteristics of the three classical ideologies and the implications of their characteristics for the development and provision of nonparental child care.

Battle, K. (1993). **The politics of stealth: Child benefits under the Tories.** In S.D. Phillips (Ed.), *How Ottawa spends: A more democratic Canada?* (Chapter 12, pp. 417-448). Ottawa, Ontario: Carleton University Press.

This article, in a book of readings examining federal government spending on social and other programs, analyses the transformation of federal income security programs for families with children from 1984 to 1992 with the announcement of the Conservative government's integrated Child Tax Benefit. This examination includes a detailed analysis of the impact of the various government changes on families with children at different income levels. The author notes that in addition to the elimination of universal benefits to all families with children, there has been a significant decline in the actual purchasing power of the financial assistance provided to parents and the amount of benefit received continues to show little relationship to family income. There is also a discussion of the role of non-government social policy groups, women's groups, and the media in the policy-making process.

Hudson, J., & Galaway, B. (Eds.). (1993). **Single parent families: Perspectives on research and policy**. Toronto, Ontario: Thompson Educational Publishing, Inc.

Part I of this book of articles by various authors provides an overview of research and policy on the single parent family in Britain, an examination of single motherhood in the United States, and a summary of the situation of single parents in France. Part II explores the demographics of the single parent family in Canada and discusses the stresses associated with single parenthood, the need for child care, and the social policy implications of the fact that the incidence of single parenthood is increasing. The impact of Canadian income tax policy, family policy, and family law on single parent families is discussed in the five articles in Part III. The following Part explores the supports needed by single parent families to ensure the well-being of their children, including the need for income assistance, affordable housing, and quality child care. Part V examines the socialization experiences of children in single parent families and reports on research studies conducted in both Canada and Britain. There is also a chapter, written by Donna Lero and Lois Brockman, which presents data on single parents and child care from the *Canadian National Child Care Study*. The book ends with suggestions for future research and policy development. It notes that much of current Canadian social policy is based on the assumption that families are two-parent families and ignores the needs of the estimated 1.5 million children who are part of single parent families. There is an extensive bibliography.

Lochhead, C. (1993). **Family poverty in Canada, 1991.** *Perception, 17*(1), 21-24.

This article reports the 1991 Statistics Canada figures for poverty rates among Canadian families on a province by province basis. It notes that the nation-wide rate was 13.1 percent in 1991, up from 12.1 percent in 1990, and that the incidence of poverty is higher among young families and female single parents. There is also a discussion of how poverty is measured and the changes in poverty rates between 1981 and 1991.

Teghtsoonian, K. (1993). **Neo-conservative ideology and opposition to federal regulation of child care services in the United States and Canada.** *Canadian Journal of Political Science, XXVI* (1), 97-121.

This article compares the arguments advanced in Canada and in the United States against a strong role for the federal government in regulating child care services. In each country, the opposition includes: a) resistance to the changes occurring in women's roles and a reassertion of the virtue of the traditional concept of the family; b) concerns about federal government interference in the market economy; and c) concerns about increasing federal government activity and regulation to the detriment of provincial/state powers. While neo-conservatives in both countries appear to share a common view of the desired relationship between the State and the family, the author suggests that some concerns about the impact of government regulation on the market economy and on provincial/state jurisdiction differ and reflect the differing social and political contexts of Canada and the United States. There is also a description of recent proposed child care regulation, the *Act for Better Child Care* in the United States (1987) and the *Canada Child Care Act* (also 1987). The *Canada Child Care Act* was not passed, but the *Act for Better Child Care* was.

McQuaig, L. (1992). **Canada's social programs: Under attack**. Toronto, Ontario: Atkinson Charitable Foundation.

This collection of articles explores the fraying of the Canadian social safety net. Included is discussion of: a) the differences between the American concept of social welfare as a last resort for people who are unable to cope on their own and the Western European concept of social welfare as a set of social rights and responsibilities to ensure the well-being of all members of the community; b) the impact of the United States' emphasis on individual freedom and responsibility and its resultant lack of support for families with children; c) Scandinavia's universally accessible and publicly funded social services and how such a system assists in the maintenance of social stability; d) the myth that social spending hampers economic growth; and e) the implications of the Canadian federal government's decision to abandon its promise of a national child care program.

Note: ■ The material in this report has been published in book form. See McQuaig, L. (1993). **The wealthy banker's wife**. Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd.

Kitchen, B., Mitchell, A., Clutterbuck, P., & Novick, M. (1991). **Unequal futures: The legacies of child poverty in Canada**. Toronto, Ontario: Child Poverty Action Group and the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

This report includes sections which examine: a) the impact of poverty on children's physical health, emotional well-being, and school achievement; b) the relationship between poverty and the likelihood of child neglect and/or abuse and/or family disintegration; c) regional differences in poverty rates in different parts of Canada; d) some of the characteristics of poor families; e) the inequalities of opportunity resulting from poverty; and f) sources of poverty such as the erosion of family social support programs over the past decade, increased taxes, restructuring by Canadian companies, and the recent federal government fiscal policies.

Kitchen, B. (1990). **Family policy**. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Families: Changing trends in Canada* (Chapter 13, pp. 306-329). Second edition. Toronto, Ontario: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.

This chapter examines: a) the different family patterns emerging in Canada; and b) the impact of current Canadian tax policies and social security programs. It notes that the income tax system: a) shows a bias towards the male breadwinner/female caregiver type of family which ignores the reality of increasing female participation in the workforce; b) supports the maintenance of a patriarchal family model; c) has deductions and refunds which benefit high income families more than low income families; and d) treats custodial and non-custodial parents differently to the detriment of the custodial parent. The current social security programs: a) support the male breadwinner/female caregiver type of family; b) are biased in favour of people who are married; and c) have reduced federal government support of families with children.

SECTION 4: THE ECONOMICS OF CHILD CARE

Introduction

The discipline of economics analyzes the behaviour of individuals and societies as they organize their production and consumption of goods and services. This involves examination of both supply and demand and of the results produced by the interaction of supply and demand. An economic analysis of child care brings a very different perspective to the debate over child care policy. The discipline of economics is particularly appropriate for the examination of issues such as: the current inequitable distribution of child care services, the appropriate extent and form of government intervention and regulation, how labour force participation of women is influenced by the availability and affordability of child care, and why child care workers receive such low wages and little reward for their investments in education and specialized training.

Cleveland, G. (1993). **Economics and child care policy**. In I. Kyle, M. Friendly, & L. Schmidt (Eds.), *Proceedings from the child care policy & research symposium.* Occasional paper No. 2 (pp. 15-35). Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This paper provides: a) an introduction to economic thinking and research methodology; b) a discussion of how the discipline of economics can illuminate the policy issues, in child care; and c) a review of what economic research has discovered to date in regard to child care. The review of the research discusses: a) how the price, availability, and quality of child care affects women's fertility and employment decisions; b) the key factors which determine the type of child care used by a family; c) the impact of costs on the supply of child care; and d) why child care workers' wages are lower than those of other workers with comparable education who are engaged in similar types of work.

Note: ■ Most of the research reviewed is from the United States. This document contains a commentary by Ruth Rose which includes additional Canadian material related to the impact of government policies.

Cleveland, G., & Hyatt, D.E. (1993). **The effect of price on the choice of child care arrangements**. In I. Kyle, M. Friendly, & L. Schmidt (Eds.), *Proceedings from the child care policy & research symposium*, Occasional paper No. 2 (pp. 89-99). Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This paper presents a statistical model for determining the probable demand for different types of child care. Preliminary work using the model and data from the Canadian National Child Care Study suggests that the demand for different types of child care, for example, centre care versus family home day care or relative care, is influenced by the family's income, the relative cost of each type of care, the mother's educational level, and the number of hours the mother works per week.

Note: ■ The authors caution that the model is still in the development stage and requires refinement. It should be noted that a fairly sophisticated knowledge of statistical methodology is required to understand the description of the model.

Bertrand, J. (1993). **Employers, unions, and child care**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care.

The purpose of this document is to illustrate the need for a comprehensive child care system in Canada and to indicate how employers and unions could support the development of public policy for such a system, which should include both family support benefits and early childhood education services. This document is divided into three sections. The first section discusses why it is in the interest of employers and unions to support investment in child care. The second section discusses: a) current child care policy in Canada; b) employer and/or union sponsored child care initiatives; c) various options for workplace child care; and d) family support benefits. The final section suggests how a comprehensive Canadian child care system might be developed. A bibliography is provided.

Blau, D.M. (Ed.). (1991). **The economics of child care**. New York, N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation.

This American collection of essays written by economist researchers in the child care field covers the following topics: a) the impact of government shifts in child care subsidies; b) the performance of the child care market in terms of economic efficiency; c) the impact of child care costs on women's fertility and employment decisions; d) the relationship between quality and the cost of child care; and e) the difference between child development and economic views of child care quality. The comments of the child care experts on the positions of the economists serve to broaden the debate on current key child care policy issues as well as placing them in a broader social context.

Edelman, M.W. (1989). **Economic issues related to child care and early childhood education.** *Teachers College Record, 90*(3), 342-351.

This article notes the interrelationship between social policy (which includes child care policy) and economic policy and explores the benefits of affordable, appropriate child care on the family, the child, and the country as a whole. The author notes: a) that the availability of child care acts as a buffer against welfare dependency and poverty by enabling parents to engage in full-time employment; b) that quality child care produces future education-related benefits for the child; and c) that the decline in the available pool of employees as a result of recent demographic trends increases the need to boost worker productivity through ensuring that all future workers have basic reading, writing and mathematical skills. Edelman also observes that current employers benefit when their employees have reliable, affordable child care since this is associated with reduced absenteeism and greater worker productivity.

Reisman, B., Moore, A.J., & Fitzgerald, K. (1988). **Child care: The bottom line**. New York, N.Y.: Child Care Action Campaign.

The first part of this American publication identifies the policy positions of the Child Care Action Campaign. Part II examines the child care market from the perspective of users' needs, what families gain and lose when they provide child care themselves, the cost and funding of child care, and the problem of ensuring quality child care. The final part discusses child care as an economic necessity for the country's future. It points out that at a time when the available labour force is declining, thus limiting economic expansion, many women are prevented from working due to the lack of affordable child care. Furthermore, quality

child care can improve the productivity of the future generation of workers by providing children with a good basis for academic success.

See also

Section 1

Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care. (1993). **A child care agenda for the 90's: Putting the pieces together**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care.

The two papers that would be particularly relevant to the issue of the economics of child care would be:

Friendly, M. (1992). **Child care in a public policy context**.

Oloman, M. (1992). **Child care funding**.

Section 3

McQuaig, L. (1992). **Canada's social programs: Under attack**. Toronto, Ontario: Atkinson Charitable Foundation.

Section 11

Hartman, H.I., & Pearce, D.M. (1989). **High skill and low pay: The economics of child care work**. Paper prepared for the Child Care Action Campaign. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Cameron, V. (1986). **The benefit-costs of preschool child care programs: A critical review**. Paper prepared for the Special Committee on Child Care. Ottawa, Ontario: House of Commons Canada.

Townson, M. (1986). **The costs and benefits of a national child care system in Canada.** *Women's Education des Femmes*, *4*(4), 16-18.

SECTION 5: FAMILY POLICY AND CHILD CARE IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Introduction

Child care policies are sometimes the offshoot of welfare, employment, gender equity or economic policies rather than the result of a larger comprehensive family policy. They are also almost always affected by practical problems and the context of the unique history and social structure of the country in question. This section provides references to documents which examine family policy as it relates to child care and/or child care provision in countries other than Canada. It is divided into the following sections:

- **Overview documents** which discuss and/or compare child care in a number of different countries
- **Documents relating to specific countries** (Denmark, France, Sweden, and the United States)

Overview documents

Kamerman, S.B. (1993). **International perspectives on child care policies and programs.** *Pediatrics, 91*(1), Part 2, 248-252.

This article provides a brief overview of child care availability and policies in northern and western Europe. This article discusses centre-based child care, family day care, and preschools in northern and western Europe with particular emphasis on differences in funding and the extent to which the public sector is involved. Information is provided on paid maternity/parenting leave in 17 countries. Three models are noted: the educational model with a discussion of its practice in France; the special child care program with a discussion of its practice in Sweden; and the dual system in Britain.

European countries acknowledge the importance of preschool programs for three- to six-year olds for socialization and education whether or not mothers are working. Increasingly, child care is viewed as a public responsibility in these countries and as an entitlement for children. Consequently, programs for preschoolers are increasingly universal, free, and while voluntary, used by almost all families. Similarly, most industrialized countries recognize the necessity of establishing national, statutory maternity/parenting polices that permit working parents some time off after childbirth without losing employment. There is a growing trend in Europe to extend parenting leaves to make it possible for one parent to stay at home at least until the child is 18 months or two years old.

Note: ■ Kamerman, S.B. (1991). **Child care policies and programs: An international overview**. *Journal of Social Issues, 47*(2), 179-196, covers basically the same material.

Lamb, M.E., Sternberg, K.J., Hwang, C.-P., & Broberg, A. (Eds.). (1992). **Child care in context: Cross-cultural perspectives**. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This collection of articles examines nonparental care in an historical, sociocultural, and political context. Child care experts from around the world look at the various goals and purposes of nonparental child care and how these effect the development of child care policies and practice. Goals examined include: a) protection of class interests; b) fostering gender-neutral employment practices; c) acculturation of immigrants; d) reduction of welfare dependency; and e) enrichment of children's lives. Actual child care provision is described for the following countries: Africa, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Italy, Israel, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Commentaries discuss how practice reflects the sociocultural and/or political realities in different countries. The final article discusses some of the key issues that arise in the earlier articles: a) the value placed on children in different societies; b) attitudes about maternal employment and child care; c) the day-to-day experience of children in different societies; and d) the importance of alternative care.

Kamerman, S.B., & Kahn, A.J. (1991). **Child care, parental leave, and the under 3s: Policy innovation in Europe**. New York, N.Y.: Auburn House.

This book explores the impact of different policies on parental leave and child care in different countries on children under age three and on income support policies. This book of readings begins with an introductory chapter which defines the issues related to parental leave and child care and provides summary information about parental leave policies in various European countries. The following six chapters explore the parental leave and child care policies and practices in Austria, Germany, France, Hungary, Finland, and Sweden. The concluding chapter reflects on the varying policies and what has been learned from the European experience, and discusses possible future trends. The book indicates that maternity and parental leave, child care, and income support for families with young children must be part of a coherent national policy package.

Melhuish, E.C., & Moss, P. (Eds.). (1991). **Day care for young children: International perspectives**. New York, N.Y.: Tavistock/Routledge.

This collection of writings by different authors highlights five countries: France, Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and examines nonparental care for young children within the social context of each of five countries. It describes: a) family support such as parental leave; b) the current system of child care in the country in question including variables such as staff training and child care funding; c) the main factors which have shaped the system for example, the perceived purpose of child care; and d) the extent and type of usage of child care. The second chapter provides an overview of research on nonparental care.

Moss, P. (1990). **Childcare in the European Communities 1985-1990.** Brussels: Commission of the European Communities, *Women of Europe Supplements*, No. *31*, August, whole issue.

This issue describes the main developments in the member countries in the area of child care services and the reconciliation of family and workplace responsibilities. National reports covering parental employment, employment rights for parents, child care services and developments in these areas between 1985 and 1990 in Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom are presented in this issue. It also discusses child care as an issue related to employment equity for women, an overview of the European situation, and conclusions.

European Child Care Network, Commission of the European Communities. (1989). **Who cares for Europe's children?** Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Community.

In this publication, the relationship between child care, gender, and occupational inequity are explored. Part I documents how the costs of bearing and raising children are currently carried disproportionately by women in all the member states of the European Community and discusses various countries' provisions for parental leave and nonparental child care. Part II concludes that women carry an unequal and disproportionate share of child care work and responsibility, that access to the full range of job opportunities assumes a willingness and ability to follow a male pattern of employment, and that the male pattern of employment neither recognizes nor accommodates family responsibilities. It argues that child care is not a woman's problem in the sense that it is not one caused by women or one that they should have to resolve on their own. Responsibility for child care must be shared by fathers, employers and society at large. Therefore, for example, fathers must be more involved in the care of their children, employers must make structural adaptations that will help employees to reconcile their job and parenthood, and society must ensure adequate parental leave and accessible, quality child care for all who want it.

Olmsted, P.P., & Weikart, D.P. (Eds.). (1989). **How nations serve young children: Profiles of child care and education in 14 countries**. Ypsilanti, MI.: High/Scope Press.

This book provides a national profile of early childhood education policy and practice for each country. Articles by early childhood education practitioners from various countries provides profiles for each of the following: Belgium, Germany, Finland, Hong Kong, Hungary, Italy, Kenya, Nigeria, China, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, and the United States. Most articles provide some information on demographics, national policies related to family support and child care, and the types of child care services provided. A historical overview is provided for several countries.

European Child Care Network, Commission of the European Communities. (1988). **Child care and equality of opportunity: Consolidated report of the European Commission**. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Community.

The link between the provision of assistance with child care and gender equality in the workforce is examined in this report. This extremely comprehensive report focuses on the provision of child care and assistance in child rearing for children up to the age of ten. It includes: a) an analysis of the relationship between child care, gender, and inequality in employment; b) a discussion of the major parameters of

diversity among families with young children, for example, number of children, family composition; c) an examination of employment adaptations that make it easier for parents to reconcile family and occupational responsibilities; d) a discussion of policies that help parents obtain and maintain appropriate child care; e) a description of current child care services in Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom, including funding and sponsorship; f) a discussion of major issues such as regulation, parental involvement, and child care for minority children; and g) an identification of child care staffing, including issues such as training and compensation. The report ends with a list of recommendations.

Note: ■ The information on actual practice in the various countries dates from 1988. In some instances there will have been changes. **Who cares for Europe's children?** (European Child Care Network, 1989), (see previous page) summarizes the material from this report with the exception of the data on policies and actual practice in various countries.

International Labour Office. (1988). **Work and the family: The child care challenge.** *Conditions of Work Digest*, special issue, *7*(2). Geneva: International Labour Office.

This special issue examines how communities and workplaces in industrialized countries deal with the family responsibility needs of working parents. Part I provides a contextual overview including the implications of the trend to increased female participation in the workforce and the emerging legal and policy requirements to promote equality of opportunity and treatment between men and women. Part II provides excerpts of declarations and recommendations relevant to child care and work/family responsibilities which have been adopted by the International Labour Office, major international and regional trade unions, and governments (including Canada). Part III provides fact sheets which summarize the legislative provisions relevant to child care for working parents for 31 countries. The final section, Part IV, summarizes existing national policies on child care for working parents. It should be noted that the information came from documentation supplied by the responsible governments and organizations. Therefore, the descriptions reflect the perspective of those organizations and may not represent a complete picture of how services and policies operate in a particular culture.

Note: ■ The information dates from 1988 and in many instances there will have been changes in policy, legislation and/or practice. The Canadian material is quite inaccurate. However, the contextual summary provides a good overview of the main policy issues and Part II provides information concerning needs from the perspective of the United Nations, the Council of Europe, the European Community, and major trade unions.

Deller, J. (1988). **Family day care internationally: A literature review**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This document provides information on the status of family day care around the world. This comprehensive review includes: a) a policy framework for viewing the practice of family day care in different countries; b) a description of how family day care operates in Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States, and West Germany. The information for each country is organized under the following headings: a) status of providers; b) government, community and parent involvement in decision-making; c) organizational structures and programs; d) funding; and e) the effectiveness of family

day care as it is viewed in the country in question.

Note: ■ Much of the information in this report was collected in 1987; therefore, there may have been changes in some countries.

Documents relating to specific countries

Denmark

Corsini, D.A. (1991). **Family day care in Denmark: A model for the United States?** *Young Children, 46*(5), 10-15.

An overview of how family day care is supervised and supported in Denmark is provided. This article describes: a) the role of the family day care supervisor; b) the regulations regarding providers' responsibilities; c) the providers' union; d) funding arrangements; and e) the provision of social support for the providers. It then discusses those aspects of the Danish system that might improve family day care as it is practised in the United States. The regular involvement of trained supervisors with case loads that allow for meaningful involvement is the key to quality family day care.

France

McMahan, I.D. (1992). **Public preschool from the age of two: The école maternelle in France.** *Young Children, 47*(5), 22-28.

Information about child care programs in France for two- and three-year olds is provided in this article. An overview of the purpose, organization, and staffing in French preschools is given. A description of an average day's program and a brief summary of research on the impact of preschool on later school achievement are included.

Howes, C., & Marx, E. (1992). **Raising questions about improving the quality of child care: Child care in the United States and France.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 7*(3), 347-366.

This article contains stimulating discussion of child care standards, and provides a summary of United States' and French child care regulations, adult:child ratios, and staff training. It also contains some sample observations of staff:child interactions in French child care centres. The high level of training among French child care workers may give them skills which offset the possible negative impact of a larger number of children per care provider than is recommended by the U.S. National Association for the Education of Young Children.

French-American Foundation. (1990). **A welcome for every child: How France achieves quality in child care - Practical ideas for the United States**. A report of the child care study panel of the French-American Foundation. New York, N.Y.: French-American Foundation.

The findings of a two-week study tour by experts in child care and others to identify concepts and approaches that might be replicated in the United States are examined. This comprehensive report provides information on: a) France's child and family policies; for example, parental leave and medical care; b) usage of child care by age and type of child care in each of France and the United States; c) the different types of programs for children under age six in France; d) staff recruitment, training and compensation in France; and e) family day care in France and how it is supported; for example, through information and visits by a trained child care professional.

Dowd, N.E. (1989). **Envisioning work and family: A critical perspective on international models.** *Harvard Journal on Legislation, 26*, 311-348.

The assumptions and consequences of work and family policies in Sweden and France are examined based on interviews with key informants in France and Sweden conducted in 1988. Part I of the article summarizes the current debate on work and family in the United States, Part II provides a detailed description of the work- and family-related policies in each of France and Sweden, Part III discusses the impact of each country's policies. The basis of Sweden's policies is the concept of gender equality which arose from the need to encourage women to enter the labour force. In contrast, the French vision supports women as childbearers and mothers, and arose from a concern about falling birthrates. In spite of the avowed gender equality approach in Sweden, job segregation by gender remains the norm, and women rather than men take advantage of parental leave. In France, the declining birthrate has stabilized to 1.9-2.0 children per woman while family roles and responsibilities continue to follow the traditional gender-specific model. In the opinion of the author, the limitations of both the French and the Swedish visions have tended to reinforce traditional gender roles and the status quo in the workplace As a result, there has been little fundamental change in workplace structures or in the segregation of women into lower paying job categories.

Sweden

Hwang, C.-P. (1993). **Scandinavian experience in providing alternative care.** *Pediatrics, 91*(1), Part 2, 264-270.

An overview of the Swedish child care system is provided in this article: a) discusses the Swedish parental leave program and its impact on the use of child care; b) describes different types of child care and their associated structural variables such as building design, staff training, ratios, and group sizes; c) describes municipal day care; d) provides information on the financing of child care in Sweden; and e) summarizes research on child care in Sweden. It also points out the author's view of shortcomings in Swedish child care: a) limited choice; b) too much homogeneity, (most centres look alike and have very similar programs); c) variations in the quantity of child care available in different parts of the country; and d) under-representation of immigrant children in child care.

Swedish Institute. (1992). **Child care in Sweden**. Fact Sheets on Sweden. New York, N.Y.: Swedish Institute, Swedish Information Services.

This document provides information on: a) family support services such as maternity leaves, free maternity and health care, and compensation for loss of income when a parent in the workforce remains at home to look after a sick child; b) the various forms of child care available in Sweden; c) regulation of the provision of child care; d) the funding of child care, e) staff qualifications and training; and f) child care for children with special needs.

Hwang, C.-P., & Broberg, A.G. (1992). **The historical and social context of child care in Sweden.** In M.E. Lamb, K.J. Sternberg, C.-P. Hwang, & A.G. Broberg (Eds.), *Child care in context: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 27-53). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

An overview of centre-based child care and family day care in Sweden within its social and political context is given. This chapter provides: a) a history of child care in Sweden; b) information about family policies such as parental leave; c) information on the usage of different types of child care; and d) a description of family day care.

Dowd, N.E. (1989). **Envisioning work and family: A critical perspective on international models.** *Harvard Journal on Legislation, 26*, 311-348.

This document, annotated in the section on France, also contains material specific to Sweden.

United States

Scarr, S., Phillips, D., McCartney, K., & Abbott-Shim, M. (1993). **Quality of child care as an aspect of family and child care policy in the United States.** *Pediatrics, 91*(1), Part 2, 182-188.

This article discusses the implications of the United States' lack of a coherent family policy and national child care standards on the quality of child care. The first part of the article discusses U.S. policy on family allowances and tax relief in the context of those of Canada and a sample of European countries. It then discusses the wide variation in child care regulations between states and the impact this has on quality.

Hayes, C.D., Palmer, J.L., & Zaslow, M.J. (1990). **Who cares for America's children?** Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

A report to the Panel on Child Care Policy of the United States' National Research Council, this book includes chapters which discuss the various options in the United States for the provision of nonparental care ranging from centres to care by relatives. The discussion includes school-based programs, employer-provided care federal and state policies as they relate to parental leave, tax credits, vouchers system, and aids to families or to children with special needs. It also identifies some of the major barriers to the provision of child care services such as lack of staff, and staff turnover.

See also

Hewlett, S.A. (1993). **Child neglect in rich nations**. New York, N.Y.: United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF.

McQuaig, L. (1993). **The wealthy banker's wife: The assault on equality in Canada.** Toronto, Ontario: Penguin Books.

SECTION 6: THE EFFECTS OF CHILD CARE

Introduction

There has been considerable debate about the effects of child care on children, especially on children enroled younger than age one, in both the professional literature and the general media. Current research suggests that the well-being and development of children in child care depends upon a combination of child characteristics and temperament, family factors such as socio-economic status, the quality of child care received by the child, and the consistency of the substitute child care arrangement. Studies have shown that poor quality child care may be detrimental but that high quality child care has positive long-term effects. The reader is referred to Section 8 for citations related to the impact of poor or high quality child care on child well-being and development.

This section is divided into the follow sections:

- **Overview documents**
- **Research**

▸ Overview documents

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1991). **The impact of child care on children's well-being and development.** In *Factors related to quality in child care: A review of the literature*, (pp. 5-14). Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This chapter addresses the three main areas of concern identified in the professional literature: a) that enrolment of children under the age of one may disrupt the development of a secure mother:infant attachment; b) that enrolment in child care has a negative effect on the child's social development; and c) that children in child care experience more infections than age-mates being reared at home.

Research findings and informed opinion related to the impact of child care on: a) mother:child attachment; b) social development; and c) the risk of infectious illnesses are presented.

The research does not indicate that enrolment in child care has a negative impact on mother:child attachment or social development even if the child is enroled as an infant, but it does indicate that children in child care are vulnerable for a period of time or under certain conditions to some kinds of infections.

Clarke-Stewart, K. A. (1991). **A home is not a school: The effects of child care on children's development.** *Journal of Social Issues, 47*(2), 105-123.

This article explains research findings indicating that the social and intellectual development of children in centres is advanced over that of children in home care (with mother, sitter, or family-based child care provider). This review presents and discusses the findings of research studies and provides an analysis of the qualitative differences between home and centre care. The most likely causes of the differences

in children's development are: a) opportunities to practice skills and follow rules with a variety of peers and non-parental adults; b) the encouragement of independence by trained and non-authoritarian child care providers; and c) programming which fosters social and intellectual skill development.

Hayes, C.D., Palmer, J.L., & Zaslow, M.J. (1990). **The effects of child care**. In *Who cares for America's children? Child care policy for the 1990s* (Chapter 3, pp. 45-83). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

The provision of guidance and recommendations for government policy development and program decision-makers is examined. This review of the professional literature discusses the basic principles of child development and the evolution of child care research, namely: a) the "first wave" which examined maternal deprivation; b) the "second wave" which examined the impact of variation in child care quality; and c) the "third wave" which examined the relationships between family and child care environments. The findings of studies in each research wave are summarized with particular emphasis on social and cognitive development. There is also a section on methodological issues related to each group of studies.

The review makes the following conclusions:

1. Child care per se is not harmful to children's development unless it is poor quality child care.

2. The quality of the child care received is an important determinant of outcome.

3. Children who are cared for in both child care and the family are influenced by both. One environment can offset or complement the impact of the other.

Phillips, D., McCartney, K., Scarr, S., & Howes, C. (1987). **Selective review of infant day care research: A cause for concern!** *Zero to three*, *7*(3), 18-20.

This article is a rebuttal to an article by Jay Belsky suggesting negative consequences for children who are enroled in child care before age one. This review of research studies provides a critique of Belsky's interpretation of the research he cited to suggest that child care before age one is detrimental to children's well-being and development. The article also presents other studies which do not indicate this.

The article concludes the well-being and development of children cannot be attributed solely to any one of: a) age of entry into child care; b) family factors; or c) the stability and quality of the child care. Instead, these variables probably interact to determine outcome.

Note: ■ Belsky, J. (1986). **Infant day care: A cause for concern?** *Zero to Three*, *6*(5), 1-7.

Research

Andersson, B-E. (1992). **Effects of day-care on cognitive and socioemotional competence of thirteen-year-old Swedish school children,** *Child Development, 63,* 20-36.

This article explores the impact of age of child care enrolment on children's cognitive and social functioning at age 13. The sample consisted of 114 children and three different types of preschool experience, through: centre-based child care, family-based child care, and no nonparental child care. Roughly 30% of the sample had been enroled in child care before age one and another 50% entered child care by age four.

Parent interviews were utilized to collect information about the family background, as well as a standardized test to measure each child's intelligence, a standard questionnaire on various behaviours that might be exhibited by a child completed by the child's current teacher and teacher assessment of each child's school performance in a variety of subjects.

The study found that:

1. Children entering either centre-based child care or family day care before age one performed better in school at age 13 and received more positive ratings from their teachers in areas such as cooperation, peer relationships, independence, and self-confidence than did children who entered child care at a later age.

2. Children without experience in child care received the lowest ratings on school performance and the lowest ratings on some, but not all, aspects of social competence.

3. Age of entry explained the greatest amount of variance among children's school performance and ratings on social competence followed by family socio-economic status.

4. The impact of family socio-economic status was less for children entering child care at a younger age than for those who entered child care when older.

Note: ■ The researcher controlled for differences in children's intelligence and examined the impact of family variables such as socio-economic status and mother's level of education. The researcher notes that there is a consistent high quality in child care in Sweden. Therefore, some of the findings reported as being associated with age of enrolment may also reflect the impact of the high quality of the child care received. This is a follow-up study to one published earlier when the children were age 8, see Andersson, B.E. (1989). **Effects of public day-care: A longitudinal study**, *Child Development, 60,* 857-866.

Field, T. (1991). **Quality infant daycare and grade school behavior and performance.** *Child Development, 62*(4), 864-870.

This article explores the relationship between experience in full-time quality child care and: a) teacher ratings of children's emotional well-being and social competence; and b) school performance when the child was in grade six. The sample consisted of fifty-six children from various ethnic backgrounds currently enroled in two sixth grade classes at a university laboratory elementary school in the United States. All children had been enroled in full-time child care before age two and had attended child care until school

entry. There were six centres, all considered to be high quality. A videotape of the children during face-to-face interactions with peers, a behaviour rating scale completed by teachers and the child's school grades for the final grading period of their sixth grade year was utilized.

The study found that:

1. There was a statistically significant positive correlation between length of time in child care and a) teacher positive ratings of the child's emotional well-being, attractiveness, and child assertiveness; b) mathematics grade; and c) likelihood of being in a class for gifted children.

2. Children who had experienced longer time in child care were rated by teachers as less aggressive than those with shorter time in child care. This finding was not statistically significant but is of interest because of the concern sometimes expressed that children who attend child care will become more aggressive than children without child care experience.

Note: ■ All the children had attended high quality child care, as defined by the researcher. Therefore, the findings attributed to length of time in child care could also reflect the fact that the child received quality programming.

Howes, C. (1988). **Relations between early child care and schooling.** *Developmental Psychology, 24*(1), 53-57.

This article explores the relationship between aspects of child care (age of enrolment, full- or part-time attendance, number of child care arrangements, and quality of the child care received) and the child's school adjustment at the end of grade one. The sample consisted of 87 children who had attended 81 different child care centres and family-based child care homes in California. Forty-nine percent of the programs were rated as high quality, 30% were rated as medium quality, and 21% were ranked as low quality. A parental questionnaire was utilized to collect information on family background, current situation when the child was in grade one, and the child's child care experience. The child care settings the children had attended were noted by two child care experts during on-site visits. Teachers noted the child's peer relationship skills and school skills at the end of grade one. Parents completed a standardized child behaviour scale at the end of grade one.

The study found that:

1. Early entry into child care predicted better academic progress for boys than their male peers who were older at the time of their first child care experience and better school skills (for example, ability to stay focused on a task) for girls.

2. Once family characteristics were accounted for, child care quality predicted school skills, such as ability to stay focused on a task, and reported incidence of behaviour problems for both boys and girls.

3. After family characteristics were accounted for, academic progress was predicted by a stable child care arrangement for girls and by both a stable child care arrangement and quality of care for boys.

4. There was no significant difference in academic progress, school skills, or incidence of behaviour problems related to full- or half-day enrolment, maternal employment status, or family structure (one- or two-parent family).

Note: ■ The researcher statistically controlled for the impact of family socio-economic variables. The ratings of the child care settings appear to have been done several months after the child left the setting. This introduces the possibility of some changes in the child care setting between the time of the child's attendance and the time of its rating.

Vandell, D., Henderson, V.K., & Wilson, K.S. (1988). **A longitudinal study of children with day care experiences of varying quality.** *Child Development, 59*, 1286-1292.

This article examines the impact of poor versus good quality child care on children's sociability with peers, compliance with adults, task orientation, impulse control, and emotional affect when the children are eight-year-olds. The sample consisted of 20 children and three centres rated as high quality and three centres rated as low quality. The study was conducted in Texas. A videotape of each child interacting with two other previously unknown children during four standardized situations with the behaviour shown ranked using a five point scale was utilized. An interview with each child obtained his/her perception of the other two children (i.e. as shy, a fighter, etc.). A parental questionnaire was designed to assess peer relationships and other child behaviours.

The study found that:

1. The impact of family socio-economic status was statistically controlled. Children from centres defined as high quality were observed to spend more time in friendly interactions with other children and less time in unfriendly interactions than did children from settings categorized as poor quality, and were rated as having greater social competence.

2. Children from centres rated as poor quality were more often identified by their peers as shy.

3. With the impact of social class controlled, children who had experienced more positive interactions with adults when they were in child care were rated at age eight as more socially competent, more accepted by peers, more empathetic, more capable of negotiating conflict, and less impulsive than other children in their class.

Note: ■ This is a follow-up study to Vandell, D.L., & Powers, C.P. (1983). **Day care quality and children's free play activities**. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 53*(3), 493-500.

See also:

Section 16

Vandell, D.F., & Corasaniti, M.A. (1988). **The relation between third graders' after-school care and social, academic, and emotional functioning**. *Child development, 59*, 868-875.

SECTION 7: PARENTAL CHILD CARE NEEDS AND PREFERENCES

Lero, D.S., Goelman, H., Pence, A., Brockman, L., & Nuttall, S. (1992). **Parental work patterns and child care needs**. Report from the Canadian National Child Care Study. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

This study collected information about parents' child care needs and preferences, the factors influencing parental choice of child care type, the kind and quality of care Canadian children currently receive, and the impacts of various child care arrangements. The sample consisted of 24,155 families with a child under age 13 selected to provide appropriate representation from each province. Children and families living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories were not included nor were children and families living on Indian reserves. Individual telephone or personal interviews with the parent identified as having primary responsibility for child care arrangements were utilized. All interviews were conducted using a standard interview protocol.

The major findings of the study revealed that:

1. The predominant family form, even among families with infants and toddlers, is the dual-earner family. In 1988, 46% of families with a child younger than age 3 were dual-earner families as were 49% of families where the youngest child was between age 3 and 5.

2. In 1988, close to 52% of all families with a child between age 0 and 5 were composed of dual-earner couples or employed sole-support parents.

3. Most parents who work, work full-time. Even in families with children younger than age 3, both parents worked full-time in about 67% of dual-earner families.

4. Only 55% of working parents had a standard work week schedule (Mondays to Fridays only, with fixed daytime hours, predominantly between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.).

5. About 40% of the parents said that their schedule varied from week to week.

6. One or both parents worked at least one weekend day in 47% of the dual-earner families, and one or both parents worked either a fixed late day shift or a night shift in 21% of dual-earner situations.

7. An estimated 60% of families with children younger than age 13 required some child care to support parental employment.

8. Roughly 34% of children age 0-5 required care for 30 or more hours each week to support parental employment, as did close to 40% of 6-9 year olds and 45% of children aged 10-12.

9. In families where the parent primarily responsible for child care worked, only 53% of children younger than age 6 and 55% of school-age children could be described as having care needs that conformed to a standard work week. Roughly 27-29% of preschool and school-age children required care for at least one weekend day. Between 10-12% of preschool and school-age children needed care while their parent worked a fixed late day or night shift. Approximately 28% of preschool and school-age children needed care that would accommodate an irregular work schedule that varied from day to day.

10. An estimated one in eight families who needed full-time care for at least one preschooler had a combined 1987 annual parental income of $20,000 or less.

Note: ■ Two other reports from the Study provide information on parental child care needs and preferences. They are: **Where are the children: An overview of child care arrangements in Canada (1993)** and **Where are the children: An analysis of child care arrangements used while parents work or study (in preparation, 1994)**. Together, these two reports provide information on the types of child care used for children of different ages, the reasons for which children are in child care, child and family characteristics, how the parents searched for child care, and parents' satisfaction with their child care arrangement.

Mock, K.R. (1988). **Child care needs of cultural and racial minorities.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 2(2), 111-125.

This study identifies the specific problems faced by immigrants and cultural minority groups. The sample consisted of 65 individuals from different parts of Canada representing the following ethnic groups: Arab, Canadian-born, Chinese, East Indian, Caribbean Black, Canadian Black, Filipino, Greek, Jewish, Native Canadian, Japanese, Italian, Pakistani, Punjabi, East African, Vietnamese, Ukrainian, Lebanese, German, and Spanish. Personal or telephone interviews were utilized. An extensive review of the literature on the child care needs of cultural minorities was also conducted.

The study found that:

1. Needs vary, not by ethnocultural group, but by: stage of acculturation, socio-economic status, size of the ethnic community, norms of the ethnic community, and available options.

2. All ethnic groups expressed the need for: a) good translation and interpreter services; b) at least one person in a centre who can communicate effectively with the parent and child, preferably a person from the same cultural, linguistic and racial background; c) staff training in cultural awareness and multicultural early childhood education; d) multicultural curriculum materials; and e) parent involvement.

3. Many ethnic groups identified the desirability of visible minority staff to provide role models for children.

4. Were choices readily available, most ethnic respondents stated they would prefer culturally and racially integrated centre-based care with at least one person who was from the same racial and/or ethnic background as their child and who could speak their language in order to interpret the system to them and their culture to other staff and children. Most parents consulted felt that such a multicultural centre would best prepare their children to adjust to elementary school while at the same time retaining their self-esteem.

The most preferred model of child care was integrated community-based centre care, with a multicultural curriculum and a well-trained, multilingual and multiracial staff sensitive to the backgrounds and needs of the children and their families.

Note: ■ Other aspects of this article are also annotated in Section 20 - Multicultural Child Care.

SECTION 8: QUALITY

Introduction

Quality child care has been defined as child care which:

- supports and facilitates the child's physical, emotional, social, and intellectual well-being and development; and
- supports the family in its child-rearing role. (Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1991). **Factors related to quality in child care: A review of the literature**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.)

This section is divided into the following sections:

- **Overview Documents**
- **Research**

▸ Overview Documents

Doherty, G. (1991). **Quality matters in child care**. Huntsville, Ontario: Jesmond Publishing.

This review of over 100 research studies conducted in Canada, the United States, Western Europe, Bermuda, and New Zealand discusses quality in centre-based and family day care. Quality as a global construct and the following discrete indicators of quality are covered: a) the interaction between child and child care provider; b) provider characteristics such as education, training, and experience; c) the child environment, including structural factors, programming, and staff stability; d) the adult work environment; and e) contextual factors such as auspice and regulation. There are also chapters on child care in a multicultural context, school-age child care, and the maintenance of quality. An extensive bibliography is included.

Hayes, C.D., Palmer, J.L., & Zaslow, M.J. (Eds.). (1990). **Who cares for America's children?** (Part II, Chapters 4 & 5, pp. 84-144). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

The implications for practice derived from research are identified in these two chapters. They contain discussions of the research findings related to: a) structural factors like ratio; b) other factors like care provider stability; c) provisions for health and safety; d) relationships with peers and adults; e) language development; and f) cognitive development. There is also an identification of the implications for practice suggested by these findings and sections which address the specific needs of minority children, children with special needs, and school-age children.

Phillips, D.A. (Ed.). (1987). **Quality in child care: What does research tell us?** Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

This document identifies the components of good quality care by examination of the research on child well-being and development while in child care. An overview of the research related to: a) structural factors like ratio; b) programming; and c) other factors like staff stability is provided. There is also a discussion about the joint effects of the child care and family environments and detailed presentations of the findings from five North American studies.

Research

Whitebook, M., Howes, C., & Phillips, D. (1990). **Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America**. Final report of the National Child Care Staffing Study. Oakland, CA.: Child Care Employee Project.

This document examines: a) the relationship between centre staff characteristics, adult work environments, and the quality of child care; and b) the differences in centre quality, centre staff, and adult work environments in centres that varied with respect to accreditation status, proposed (but never implemented) U.S. 1980 federal standards, and auspices. The sample consisted of 227 centres in five different U.S. states. Centres were randomly selected to provide representation of high-, middle-, and low-income neighbourhoods, and urban or suburban areas. The staff sample consisted of 1,309 staff members selected to provide representation from infant, toddler, preschool and mixed-aged classrooms.

The study utilizes the following measures: a) classroom observations which included using the *Staff Sensitivity Scale* (Arnett, in press), the *Adult Involvement Scale* (Howes & Stewart, 1987), and either the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980) or the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1986); b) standardized tests to measure the complexity of the child's social play, the child's degree of attachment to staff members, the child's personal maturity and perceived sense of competence, and language skills; and c) interviews with the directors of each centre and with all the staff members who were observed.

The findings are reported under the following headings: a) the impact of staff education level and specific training related to child care; b) the impact of the work environment; c) the impact of characteristics of the centre such as group size and staff:child ratios; d) the impact of staff behaviour on the child; e) the impact of the extent of compliance with the 1980 proposed Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR); f) the impact of accreditation by the National Academy for the Education of Young Children; and g) the impact of auspice. The most significant predictor of quality was the interaction between the child and the caregiver; this, in turn, depended on factors such as specific post-secondary school training in the provision of child care, child-to-staff ratio levels, group size, wages and auspice.

Note:
- Two of the three journal articles annotated in this section (Howes, Phillips, & Whitebook, 1992; Phillips, Howes, & Whitebook, 1992) report specific findings from the Staffing Study which are related to a particular aspect of quality. The third journal article (Howes et al., 1992), also in this section, uses some data from the Staffing Study in addition to data collected from centres which did not participate in the Study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Howes, C., Phillips, D.A., & Whitebook, M. (1992). **Thresholds of quality: Implications for the social development of children in centre-based child care.** *Child Development, 63*, 449-460.

This study measures the quality of child relationships with adults and peers as a function of the centre's degree of compliance with the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) and as a function of the centre's total score on the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980) or the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1986). The sample consisted of 414 children from 143 centres. Forty-five of the centres were from the Atlanta sample of the National Child Care Staffing Study, and the remaining centres were California centres which had not participated in the Staffing Study.

The study found that:

1. Children in classrooms meeting FIDCR staff:child ratios were more likely to be in classrooms obtaining a high score for appropriate caregiving and for developmentally appropriate activities as measured by the relevant Harms & Clifford scale.

2. Children in classrooms rated as good or very good in appropriate caregiving as measured by the relevant Harms & Clifford scale were more likely to be securely attached to the care providers than were children in classrooms receiving lower Harms & Clifford scores. They were also more likely to be socially competent with other children.

3. Children enroled in classrooms ranked high on developmentally appropriate activity by the relevant Harms & Clifford scale were less likely to be rated as solitary than were their peers in other classrooms.

Note:
- The American Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) were developed through a long consultation process, introduced in Congress in 1980 but never passed. They are considered to be relatively high standards for provision of child care.

Phillips, D.A., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1992). **The social policy context of child care: Effects on quality.** *American Journal of Community Psychology, 20*(1), 25-51.

This study examines the effects on the quality of the child care environment of: a) the stringency of the state child care regulations in the jurisdiction in which the centre was located; b) voluntary compliance with proposed federal child care standards (the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements); and c) centre auspice. The data used in this study is that of the Staffing Study so the sample is the same, 143 centres. Forty-five of the centres were from the Atlanta sample of the National Child Care Staffing Study and the remaining centres were California centres which had not participated in the Staffing Study.

The measures utilized: a) classroom observations which included using the *Staff Sensitivity Scale* (Arnett, in press), the *Adult Involvement Scale* (Howes & Stewart, 1987), and either the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980) or the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1986); b) standardized tests to measure the complexity of the child's social play, the child's degree of attachment to staff members, the child's personal maturity and perceived sense of competence, and language skills; and c) interviews with the directors of each centre and with all the staff members who were observed.

The study found that:

1. Children in classrooms meeting FIDCR staff:child ratios were more likely to be in classrooms obtaining a high score for appropriate caregiving and for developmentally appropriate activities as measured by the relevant Harms & Clifford scale.

2. Children in classrooms rated as good or very good in appropriate caregiving as measured by the relevant Harms & Clifford scale were more likely to be securely attached to the care providers than children in classrooms receiving lower Harms & Clifford scores. They were also more likely to be socially competent with other children.

3. Children enroled in classrooms ranked high on developmentally appropriate activity by the relevant Harms & Clifford scale were less likely to be rated as solitary than were their peers in other classrooms.

See also

Section 6

Howes, C. (1988). **Relations between early child care and schooling.** *Developmental Psychology, 24*(1), 53-57.

Vandell, D., Henderson, V.K., & Wilson, K.S. (1988). **A longitudinal study of children with day care experiences of varying quality.** *Child Development, 59*, 1286-1292.

Section 9

Albrecht, K.M. (1991). **Quality criteria for school-age child care programs**. Alexandria, Va.: Home Economics Association.

Section 11

Phillips, D., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1991). **Child care as an adult work environment.** *Journal of Social Issues, 47*(2), 49-70.

Section 13

Canadian Child Care Federation. (1993). **Contextual factors and child care quality**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Child Care Federation.

Doherty, G. (1991). **Contextual factors.** In G. Doherty, *Quality Matters in Child Care* (pp. 70-81). Huntsville, Ontario: Jesmond Publishing.

Section 16

Vandell, D.F., & Corasaniti, M.A. (1988). **The relation between third graders' after-school care and social, academic, and emotional functioning.** *Child Development, 59,* 868-875.

SECTION 9: HEALTH AND SAFETY

Canadian Paediatric Society. (1992). **Well beings: A guide to promote the physical health, safety and emotional well-being of children in child care centres and family day care homes**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Paediatric Society.

This very comprehensive two volume manual provides a resource guide and manual for use in centres and family day care homes and as training material. Volume I addresses: a) the prevention and management of injuries and illness; b) handling emergencies; c) nutrition; d) dental health; e) safety provisions; and f) issues such as separation anxiety and recognition of child neglect or abuse. Volume II addresses: a) the care provider's health and safety; and b) administration. Both volumes have sections specific to family day care. An extensive bibliography and various sample forms are also included.

Note: ■ Although some of the content would be appropriate for school-age children, this age group is not specifically addressed.

Albrecht, K.M. (1991). **Quality criteria for school-age child care programs**. Alexandria, Va.: American Home Economics Association.

This manual revises and expands the accreditation criteria of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (NAEYC) to reflect the needs of school-age children and youth.

Note: ■ This manual includes sections on health and safety and on nutrition as they pertain specifically to school-age child care.

See also

Section 21

Fraser North Child Care Issues Society Exceptional Care Project. (1993). **Special health care: Recommended practices for the early education field**. Vancouver, British Columbia: Karyo Consultants.

SECTION 10: THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Greenman, J. (1988). **Caring spaces, learning places: Children's environments that work**. Redmond, WA.: Exchange Press Inc.

This book provides guidance on the design of quality child care settings by: a) discussing important dimensions of physical space, such as size, density, and spatial variety and their impact on children; b) providing information about the needs of infants and toddlers and how to develop environments that meet these needs; c) discussing aspects of the actual building, such as ceiling heights, floor coverings, bathroom design; d) making suggestions for the spatial arrangement of different parts of a child care centre; e) providing suggestions for different types of materials, equipment, and structures for indoor and outdoor programming; and f) providing advice on how to modify existing environments. The book is illustrated and easy to use.

Weinstein, C.S., & David, T.G. (Eds.). (1987). **Spaces for children: The built environment and child development**, New York, N.Y.: Plenum Press.

This collection explores different components of child care environments and their relationship to child development. Chapters include: a) an exploration of how children establish a sense of identity with an environment; b) a description the impact of various aspects of the environment such as spatial arrangement or a mixture of textures; c) a discussion of how to design an environment that is appropriate for infants and toddlers, and how to design one for preschoolers; d) information on designing playgrounds for able-bodied and for disabled children; and e) a discussion of how to convert an existing environment into one which will be more appropriate and developmentally stimulating.

Moore, G.T. (1986). **The effects of the spatial definition of behavior settings on children's behavior: A quasi-experimental field study.** *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 6*, 205-231.

This study examines the effects of different levels of spatial definition of behaviour settings, from well-defined to poorly-defined, on children's social and cognitive behaviour. Spatially well-defined settings had: a) clear boundaries and separation between circulation space, group space and activity pockets; b) space sizes that were appropriate for the activity for which they were intended; c) an appropriate amount and type of storage, work surface, and display space; d) variations in the floor coverings, textures and levels, for example, a loft and/or sunken pit; e) at least partial acoustic separation of areas for small and large group activities; and f) the materials a child required for an activity were readily available.

The sample consisted of 14 American child care centres, selected to represent a minimum of two well-defined, two moderately defined, and two poorly-defined settings. The children ranged in age from 2.5 to 6.0 years. Each centre's physical environment was rated as well-defined, moderately defined, or poorly-defined using a rating scale designed specifically for this study. Child and adult behaviour was observed on-site and coded on a scale also designed specifically for this study.

The study found that:

1. Among the children, significantly more exploratory behaviour, social interaction and cooperation occurred in well-defined behaviour settings than in moderately or poorly-defined settings.

2. There were larger amounts of positive involvement of staff with children (for example, encouragement or co-action in activities) as opposed to detachment or controlling behavior in well-defined behaviour settings versus the other two setting types.

3. There was no difference in the incidence of engaged versus random and withdrawn behaviours among the children between the three different types of settings.

SECTION 11: THE ADULT WORK ENVIRONMENT

Introduction

The adult work environment helps to determine the child care provider's job satisfaction. Research has shown that job satisfaction, in turn, predicts the adult's behaviour with children and staff turnover rates.

This section is divided into the following sections:

- **Overview documents**
- **Research**

Overview documents

Hartman, H.I., & Pearce, D.M. (1989). **High skill and low pay: The economics of child care work**. Paper prepared for the Child Care Action Campaign. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Women's Policy Research.

This paper explores the economic aspects of child care work. A review of the research literature and summarization of various United States' government statistics and other surveys provides: a) a description of the characteristics of United States' child care workers, such as educational level; b) an identification of salary and benefit levels and an examination of what influences these; c) a discussion of the issue of high turnover rates among child care workers and what causes this situation; and d) recommendations for measures to reduce turnover. The paper concludes that child care workers have above average education but receive wages that are well below average for people with comparable education levels in other settings. The combination of high skill levels and low pay results in high staff turnover. Certain types of child care work situations, such as the public sector and the school system, are associated with better working conditions, higher wages, more generous benefit packages and lower rates of turnover.

Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988). **A great place to work: Improving conditions for staff in young children's programs**. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Information to assist child care program directors to evaluate and improve the quality of the adult work environment in their program is given. This monograph provides: a) a discussion of how to measure organizational climate, including the provision of a checklist, and b) a discussion of ways to improve adult working conditions. There is also an extensive bibliography related to organizational climate and similar quality of workplace issues.

Note: ■ There is also a short version of that part of this book which deals with requirements for a positive organizational climate. See Jorde-Bloom, P. (1988). **Teachers need "TLC" too**. *Young Children*, September, 4-8.

Research

Canadian Child Care Federation/Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association. (1992). **Caring for a living**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Child Care Federation.

This study identifies the current wages and working conditions of individuals working in licensed child care centres across Canada. A sample consisting of 969 centres from across Canada was selected to provide a representative number of centres from each province and the Territories and representation from programs under municipal, non-profit and for-profit auspice. This resulted in participation by 502 centre directors and 2,383 frontline workers. A short telephone interview was conducted with centre directors, an in-depth follow-up questionnaire was mailed to centre directors, and a mail-out questionnaire was sent to frontline staff. The actual instruments were developed specifically for this study but were partially based on questionnaires developed by the United States' National Child Care Staffing Study (see entries in Section 8 and this Section), and an existing job satisfaction questionnaire.

The study found that:

1. When salary levels were adjusted for inflation, the average child care wage fell by 4.5% between 1984 and 1991 (when the data for this study were collected).

2. Frontline staff in municipal centres received 37% higher wages than staff in non-profit centres and 72% more than staff in for-profit centres. Frontline staff in rural centres earned 25% less than staff in urban centres.

3. Child care staff received 30% less than the average industrial wage for men and women in spite of the fact that almost seven out of 10 staff working in child care were found to have a post-secondary school certificate, diploma, or degree compared to only four out of ten workers in the Canadian labour force as a whole.

4. Staff received more generous benefit packages in municipal, followed by non-profit centres than they did in for-profit centres and in unionized versus non-unionized settings.

5. Frontline staff working in for-profit centres tended to have lower job satisfaction rates than those working in municipal or non-profit centres. However, 80% of all respondents expressed satisfaction with the nature of child care work. The most frustrating aspects of the job according to frontline staff were: low pay and lack of promotion opportunities (52%), the nature of the work (41%), general working conditions (20%), dealing with society and the government (17%), and dealing with superiors (15%).

6. Seventy-three percent of frontline staff stated it was likely that they would be at their current centre in one year's time. However, there were wide variations from province to province.

7. Frontline staff thinking of leaving the child care field identified the following reasons for doing so: low wages (20%), to start a family or stay at home with children (16%), would prefer to work in a public school (12%), burnout/stress (11%), and want a career change (11%).

8. Frontline staff made the following recommendations for improving child care work, listed in the order of the frequency with which they were mentioned: a) higher salaries; b) promotion of more respect among the general public for child care workers; c) improving benefits; d) improving general working conditions; e) providing preparation time during paid time; and f) establishing a career ladder in the

child care field.

9. On a national basis, 26% of staff left their jobs in the one-year period before the information was collected. Turnover rates varied considerably among provinces/territories.

Note:
- The findings are presented on a national basis; however, there is also a section which provides a summary of the main findings for each province/territory.
- The return rate for the mail-out questionnaires was 52% for directors and 34% for frontline staff on a national basis. Again, there was variation among the provinces with the return rate for some provinces being below 30%. While a return rate of 34% is within the expected range for mail-out questionnaires, it is low enough to raise the issue of sample bias. It could be that workers with high job satisfaction were more prepared to invest the time necessary to complete the questionnaire than those with low levels of job satisfaction. Conversely, workers who were dissatisfied might be more desirous of providing input into a national study on working conditions.
- This is a follow-up study to a previous national survey of wages and working conditions in child care centres and regulated family day care homes across Canada. See Schom-Moffat, P. (1984). **The bottom line: Wages and working conditions of workers in the formal day care market**. Paper prepared for the Task force on Child Care, Series I. Ottawa, Ontario: Status of Women, Canada.

Phillips, D., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1991). **Child care as an adult work environment.** *Journal of Social Issues, 47*(2), 49-70.

This study uses data from the (American) National Child Care Staffing Study identifying the predictors of job satisfaction and staff turnover and how these are linked with the appropriateness of the activities provided for the children. The sample consisted of 227 centres in five metropolitan areas. Centres were randomly selected to provide representation of high-, middle-, and low-income neighbourhoods, and urban or suburban areas. The staff sample consisted of 1,309 people selected to provide representation from infant, toddler, preschool, and mixed-aged classrooms. Each individual staff member was interviewed using a standard interview protocol. Turnover rates were obtained through director interviews and also follow-up calls to 71% of the participating frontline staff six months after their initial interview. The *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980) and the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1986) were used to assess the extent of developmentally appropriate activities. The adult needs subscale for the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* was used to assess working conditions (along with the staff interviews).

The study found that:

1. The mean ratings for the adequacy with which adult needs were met, as measured by the Early Child Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS), fell well below the "good" level of quality. For staff working with preschoolers, their centre's rating predicted job commitment and job satisfaction.

2. Two-thirds of the staff reported viewing their child care work as a career rather than a job, and 80% replied affirmatively when asked if they would again choose to work in child care. However, at the same time, 45% of staff indicated that they were "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to leave their job.

The actual average annual turnover rate was found to be 41%. The six-month follow-up calls indicated a turnover rate of 37%. Two-thirds of the people who had left were no longer working or no longer working in child care.

3. Salary level, paid preparation time, reduced-fee child care for the staff member's child, all predicted the extent of job satisfaction.

4. Staff wages were the most important negative predictor of staff turnover and positive predictor of the extent to which developmentally appropriate activities were provided for the children.

5. The adequacy with which adult needs were met as measured by the ECERS was the second most important predictor of the extent to which developmentally appropriate activities were provided.

Note: ■ Findings from this study related to auspice are annotated in Section 13. It is interesting to note that the annual American staff turnover rate was found to be 41% compared to 20% in Canada (see entry in this Section for the Canadian Child Care Federation/Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association). Only 61% of the centres asked to participate in the study agreed to do so. There is a potential for sample bias since there were higher participation rates among non-profit than for-profit centres and from centres serving low-income families. All the staff members from centres which agreed to take part in the Study and who were asked to participate did so.

Stremmel, A. (1991). **Predictors of intention to leave child care work.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6,* 285-298.

The impact of commitment to child care work, job satisfaction, and the perceived availability of alternative employment on the decision to leave or remain working in the child care field are examined. A sample consisting of 223 frontline child care staff from 52 licensed child care centres in the United States was used. The method of measurement utilized was a mail-out questionnaire which was developed for this study.

The study found that:

1. The individual's degree of commitment to the centre itself had the highest relationship with whether or not the person expressed an intention to leave the centre within the next year.

2. The most important work-related factors associated with intention to leave were, in order of significance: a) low salary; b) lack of job security; c) desire for benefits not included in the centre's benefit package; d) general working conditions; and e) lack of feedback and support from the director.

Note: ■ Two hundred and six centres were approached to participate but only 57 agreed to do so. The actual return rate from staff was 36%. This rate is within the range typical for mail-out questionnaires but is sufficiently low to raise the question of sample bias. It could be that workers with high job satisfaction were more willing to respond to a survey on work attitudes than those with low levels of job satisfaction.

Independent Child Caregivers Association. (1990). **Who cares? A study of home-based child caregivers in Ontario**. Ottawa, Ontario: Independent Child Caregivers Association.

This study provides demographic, behavioral and psychographic information on family day care providers and information on other aspects of family day care in Ontario. A province-wide sample of 727 independent (that is, not regulated) family day care providers was utilized. Telephone interview using a standard protocol was used as the measurement.

The study found that:

1. Sixty-one percent of respondents reported earning less than $5,000 from providing child care; however, it should be noted that 38% of the total sample defined their service as part-time.

2. A large proportion of the respondents reported that they were paid on the basis of attendance rather than enrolment. Less than half were paid for holidays or situations beyond their control such as children not attending because they were ill.

3. On average, caregivers reported spending 30% of their income derived from providing child care on expenses such as food, toys, and supplies.

4. Only 14% indicated that they were seriously considering changing careers.

Note: ■ The sample consisted of people known to the Association; therefore, it is not necessarily representative of all unregulated family day care providers in Ontario. Furthermore, some providers who were contacted refused to participate in the study.

Kontos, S., & Stremmel, A.J. (1988). **Caregivers' perceptions of working conditions in a child care environment.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 3*, 77-90.

Links between adult working conditions and program quality were examined. The sample consisted of 40 child care providers in 10 centres in Pennsylvania. The *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980) and a questionnaire focusing on job satisfaction, job responsibilities, and salary/benefits were utilized.

The study found that:

1. Ninety percent of the staff indicated that working with children was what they liked best about their job, 32% identified wages and an additional 23% identified hours and benefits as what they liked least.

2. There was no correlation between job satisfaction and the centre's overall score on the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale*.

See also

Section 12

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1988). **A survey of private home day care in Ontario, 1988**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Note ■ For the impact of staff job dissatisfaction on adult behaviour with children see:

Berk, L. (1985). **Relationship of caregiver education to child-oriented attitudes, job satisfaction, and behaviours towards children.** *Child Care Quarterly*, 14(2), 103-129.

Atten, D.W., & Milner, J.S. (1978). **Child abuse potential and work satisfaction in day care employees**. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 11, 117-123

Phillips, D., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1991). **Child care as an adult work environment**. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(2), 49-70.

SECTION 12: HUMAN RESOURCES

Introduction

This section is divided as follows:

- **Child care staff and provider characteristics** (in both centre-based and family day care)
- **Training**
- **Ethics**
- **Professionalism in early childhood education**

Child care staff and provider characteristics

Canadian Child Care Federation/Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association. (1992). **Caring for a living**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Child Care Federation.

This study identifies the current wages and working conditions of individuals working in licensed child care centres across Canada. A sample consisting of 502 directors and 2,383 frontline workers from 969 centres across Canada was selected to provide a representative number of centres from each province and the territories and from municipal, non-profit and for-profit programs. The method of measurement used was a mail-out questionnaire.

The study finds that:

1. Almost all the respondents were female, under age 45, married and had children of their own. Nationally, 86% of the respondents were born in Canada.

2. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents had a post-secondary school credential (a certificate, diploma, or university degree in some area of study). Of those staff with post-secondary school credentials, 27% held a one- or two-year ECE certificate, 31% held a one- or two-year ECE diploma, and 7% held an ECE bachelor's degree. There were wide variations in the percentage of staff with post-secondary school education from province to province. Paper qualifications also varied depending on the individual's position.

3. Twenty-eight percent of the respondents were currently enroled in an educational program. Of these, 35% were working towards a diploma and 22% towards a degree.

4. Forty-seven percent of the respondents had worked in the child care field for over five years. Nationally, the number of years working at their current centre was 3.4 One out of four staff had worked in their current centre for less than a year.

Note: ■ This study is also annotated in Section 11. That annotation, however, focuses on different data (those relating to adult work environments).

- The findings are presented on a national basis; however, there is also a section which provides a summary of the main findings for each province/territory.

- The return rate for the mail-out questionnaires was 52% for directors and 34% for frontline staff on a nation-wide basis. However, for some provinces it was less than 30%. While a return rate of 34% is within the expected range for mail-out questionnaires, it is low enough to raise the issue of sample bias. It could be that staff with more years of formal education were more likely to complete and return the questionnaire.

Independent Child Caregivers Association. (1990). **Who cares? A study of home-based child caregivers in Ontario. Volume I**. Ottawa, Ontario: Independent Child Caregivers Association.

Demographic, behavioral and psychographic information on family day care providers and information on other aspects of family day care in Ontario is provided in this report. A province-wide sample of 727 unregulated family day care providers was used. The method of measurement used telephone interview using a standard protocol.

The study finds that:

1. Almost all the respondents were female, under age 39, married, and had children who were still living at home. Most of their spouses worked in skilled or unskilled labour.

2. The respondents had similar educational levels to those of the female population in Ontario as a whole. Twelve percent had some university education, 21% had completed or had some community college education and 67% had completed or had some high school education.

3. Only 27% of the providers reported that they had seriously considered changing careers, 50% stated that they expected to still be providing child care in five years time.

4. Psychographic analysis suggested that the respondents were a homogeneous group. They shared a strong belief in traditional values and some resistance to change. However, their responses also indicated an acceptance of working mothers and the importance of having an occupation.

Note:
- The sample consisted of people known to the Association, therefore it is not necessarily representative of unregulated family day care providers in Ontario. Some providers who were contacted refused to participate in the Study.

- The findings of this report related to work environment are provided in Section 11.

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1988). **A survey of private home day care in Ontario, 1988**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

The purpose of this survey is to provide an overview of private home day care agencies' organizational structures, program objectives, and clients; to compare costs across agencies; to provide a description of home visitor and caregiver characteristics; to assess the extent to which Ministry standards have been accepted; to assess the degree of consistency between current Ministry expectations and those held by

the agencies, providers, and parents; and to identify factors which may inhibit program utilization. A sample consisting of 70 family day care agencies (sponsoring agencies for family day care providers), 172 day care providers, 41 home visitors (agency staff responsible for supervising day care providers), and 237 parents was utilized. Separate questionnaires for each group were specially developed for this study.

The study finds (related to human resources) that:

1. The majority of caregivers were between the ages of 25 and 34. Ten percent of the caregivers had a degree or diploma but only 4% of the sample had formal post-secondary school training in early childhood education. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents had attended at least one child care workshop.

2. Average annual provider turnover rates were 36% in for-profit agencies, 44% in non-profit agencies, and 52% in municipal agencies. The most frequent reasons for provider turnover rates were that the providers returned to school, obtained outside employment, or left the area.

3. All the home visitors were female and most were between the ages of 25 and 35. Seventy-six percent of the home visitors had an ECE degree and the remainder had a variety of certificates or diplomas in psychology, teaching or similar fields.

4. The average annual turnover rate for home visitors was 15%.

The two following Canadian studies also examined provider characteristics:

Pence, A.R., & Goelman, H. (1987). **Who cares for the child in day care? An examination of care givers from three types of care.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 2*(4), 315-334.

Pepper, S., & Stuart, B. (1985). **Private home day care providers in Ontario: A study of their personal and psychological characteristics**. London, Ontario: Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario.

Training

Doherty, G. (1991). **Caregiver characteristics.** In G. Doherty, *Quality matters in child care* (pp. 33- 45). Huntsville, Ontario: Jesmond Publishing.

This chapter examines the caregiver and program characteristics associated with quality in child care. This chapter, part of a review of the international research literature, examines: a) the impact of formal education or training related to the provision of child care; b) the impact of formal education in a field not directly related to child care versus training related to child care; c) the need for specific training for different age groups and for children with special needs; and d) the impact of years of experience.

The article concludes that post-secondary school education specific to the provision of child care is the preparation most associated with the provision of quality programming. It is probably desirable for people working with infants or with school-aged children to have specific training related to the age group in question, and for directors and supervisors to have specific training for this role.

Co-ordinators of Early Childhood Education Programs, Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. (1991). **Early childhood education: Professional competencies**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

The purpose of this report is to delineate the competencies and skills required to work with infants, toddlers, preschoolers, school-age children, and/or children with special needs. This report contains a list of underlying principles, eight competencies and the skills required for each, a bibliography, and a report on the responses of 800 key informants to the initial draft of the competency document. This report concludes that the eight competencies were strongly supported by the 800 practitioners as necessary for a new ECE graduate.

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1991). **Training needs of resource teachers, supervisors of day nurseries, and private home day care home visitors**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

This document identifies the qualifications and training required by resource teachers, supervisors, and family day care visitors (people who supervise family day care providers who have a formal affiliation with an agency). A sample consisting of 67 resource teachers, 61 centre supervisors, and 73 home visitors selected to represent various parts of Ontario was used. A separate mail-out questionnaire for each of the three staff categories was utilized.

The document finds that:

1. Over 75% of the respondents in each category stated that the current two-year ECE program offered in Ontario does not provide sufficient training for their position.

2. The majority of respondents favoured retaining the general level ECE program and providing additional specialized training.

Yeates, M., Davidson, B., Mitchell, W., & McIvor, W. (1991). **A report on school-age child care training**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This report makes recommendations for the training of school-age child care personnel. Eleven adult focus groups held in different parts of Ontario involved people working in child care and Ministry staff, participants in four focus groups for children, 73 community college ECE program coordinators (with at least one from each of the 23 colleges in the Province), and 316 people who were currently working in a school-age child care program. Focus groups and mail-out questionnaires were utilized.

The report finds that specific skills and training are required for staff working in school-age child care and these differ, in some respects, from what is required for working with younger children.

Note: ■ This report provides very specific recommendations for training people to work in school-age child care.

Spodek, B., & Saracho, O.N. (1990). **Early childhood teacher preparation**. New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

This book discusses issues related to training child care providers. It contains twelve chapters, each by a different expert in the child care field. The topics include: a) the unique aspects of early childhood education; b) different ways to provide training; c) the desirable content of training; and d) issues in recruitment, selection and retention of child care providers.

Ethics

Katz, L., & Ward, E.H. (1991). **Ethical behaviour in early childhood education: Expanded edition**. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

This document identifies what is meant by ethical behaviour and presents the Code of Ethical Conduct and Statement of Commitment adopted by the United States' National Association for the Education of Young Children. It includes a discussion of common ethical issues and problems in child care, identification of why a code of ethics is required in early childhood education, and presentation of the NAEYC code.

Professionalism in early childhood education

Morgan, G. (1991). **Career progression in early care and education: A discussion paper**. ERIC document No. 349 112.

The current lack of career progression in child care is addressed. The author proposes a model of career progression whereby different roles and requirements would be assigned to different positions and in which practitioners would experience role progression and receive increasingly greater rewards as they obtain additional training and skills. The paper also comments on training policy issues which must be addressed by the child care field.

Shimoni, R., & Friesen, B. (1990). **Day care and the quest for professionalism: Issues and dilemmas in traditional women's work**. Calgary, Alberta: Department of Sociology, University of Calgary. ERIC No. ED 333 992

This document examines the issues related to professionalism in child care. The concepts of profession and professionalization that prevail in the early childhood education literature and alternative conceptualizations from sociology are discussed. There are also discussions of: a) the technical basis for child care; b) options for jurisdiction over child care; c) training child care practitioners; d) the public image of child care; and e) possible unintended consequences of professionalization. This document concludes that there is a need to: a) develop a new definition of professionalism that encompasses female thought and experience; b) increase public perception of the importance of children; and c) examine existing differences of opinion regarding professionalism within the child care community.

Spodek, B., Saracho, O.N., Peters, D.L. (Eds.). (1988). **Professionalism and the early childhood practitioner**. New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

This book brings together a variety of perspectives on the issue of professionalism in child care. Part I explores the nature and foundation of professionalism and relates this to the child care provider. Part II presents several perspectives on the definition of professionalism. Part III addresses the development of professionalism in the early childhood education field, including different pathways and the use of theories to provide a foundation for professional development.

See also

Section 2

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1990). **Description of child care training programs in Canadian and international jurisdictions**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Section 5

Howes, C., & Marx, E. (1992). **Raising questions about improving the quality of child care: Child care in the United States and France.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 7*(3), 347-366.

SECTION 13: CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

Introduction

The term contextual factors refers to those factors which impact on the quality of care provided in a child care setting. Research indicates that these factors are: a) funding; b) auspice; c) the strength of the standards in the jurisdiction in which the program operates; d) regulation and the enforcement of government regulations; and, e) sponsorship of family day care providers by an agency.

This section is subdivided into:

- **Overview documents**
- **Research** The research component of this section is divided into: **auspice**, **government regulation**, and **sponsorship of family day care**.

Overview documents

Canadian Child Care Federation. (1993). **Contextual factors and child care quality**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Child Care Federation.

This document describes research findings from Canada and the United States regarding the impact on child care quality of auspice, funding, licensing and its enforcement, all of which are demonstrated to have an impact in the quality of care. A bibliography is included.

Doherty, G. (1991). **Contextual factors.** In G. Doherty, *Quality Matters in Child Care* (pp. 70-81). Huntsville, Ontario: Jesmond Publishing.

This chapter reviews the international research findings related to: a) funding; b) auspice; c) the strength of standards in the jurisdiction in which the program operates; d) the impact of licensing and sponsorship; and e) the impact of parent involvement.

Research

Auspice

Friesen, B.K. (1992). **A sociological examination of the effects of auspice on day care quality**. Calgary, Alberta: Department of Sociology, University of Calgary.

This document investigates the impact of auspice on the quality of program provided in a jurisdiction where regulations and funding are identical for non-profit and for-profit centres. A random sample of 45 centres in Calgary was used, 13 (28.8%) of which were non-profit and the remainder for-profit. A questionnaire was completed by each centre's director and on-site observations were made using the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al., 1990).

The study found that:

1. For-profit centres were more likely to offer poor quality care as measured by the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (53.1%) than non-profit centres (15.4%). This difference in quality held true whether the for-profit centre was independently operated or part of a chain.

2. Independent for-profit centres exhibited a greater range of quality than did for-profit centres that were part of a chain or non-profit centres and were more likely to offer poor quality care than centres in the other two groups.

3. For-profit centres as a group more often open, close, or change administration than do non-profit programs.

4. Non-profit centres reported significantly more opportunities for parent involvement than did for-profit centres and provided more special services for children.

5. For-profit centres operated by a chain were more likely than independent for-profit centres or non-profit centres to offer a variety of care options, i.e. full-time, part-time, and drop-in and reported spending a greater proportion of their budget on materials and equipment. They also tended to care for larger numbers of children and to charge higher fees than independent for-profit centres or non-profit centres.

6. There was no difference between for-profit and non-profit centres in regard to reported group sizes, staff:child ratios, or compliance with staff:child ratios.

7. Non-profit centres had more staff with early childhood education training at the certificate or diploma level and more staff who had worked at the centre for at least five years than did for-profit centres. Non-profit centres also provided more opportunity for frontline staff input into decision-making and provided more generous salary and benefit packages.

8. A statistical analysis indicated that the difference in quality provided by for-profit and non-profit centres was the result of differences between these two auspice types in organizational structure, methods of operations, and staff characteristics.

Note: ■ This dissertation also includes a comprehensive review of the history of child care, previous research studies that have examined the impact of auspice on quality, and the structural differences between for-profit and non-profit programs.

- This study supports the findings of other studies regarding the difference in the quality of care provided by non-profit and for-profit centres (for example, see the following annotation). The analysis of the impact of organizational structure, methods of operation and staff characteristics provides a possible explanation for the consistent differences found between for-profit and non-profit centres.

Phillips, D., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1991). **Child care as an adult work environment.** *Journal of Social Issues, 47*(2), 49-70.

This articles examines the impact of auspice. A sample consisting of 227 centres in five metropolitan areas in five different states was analyzed using *The Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al., 1990).

Findings (related only to auspice):

1. Both six-month and twelve-month staff turnover rates were higher in for-profit than they were in non-profit centres. Annual turnover in for-profit chains was 74% versus 51% in independent for-profit centres.

2. Non-profit centres provided better working conditions than did for-profit centres in all 12 areas that were examined.

3. Formal education levels and percentage of child care providers with training in early childhood education were higher in non-profit centres than in either type of for-profit centre.

4. Non-profit programs had a better ranking on developmentally appropriate activity than did independent for-profit centres but not better than chain for-profit centres.

5. Non-profit centres had fewer children per care provider, were more likely to have two providers per room, and were more likely to have overlapping shifts than for-profit centres.

6. Child care providers in non-profit centres were more likely to engage in appropriate caregiving than were providers in for-profit centres. Providers in both types of for-profit centres were more harsh and less sensitive with the children than providers in non-profit centres with all age groups.

7. Children in non-profit centres showed greater attachment to their care provider, spent less time in aimless wandering, showed a higher developmental level of peer play, and had higher scores on a standard measure of language development than did children in either type of for-profit centre.

8. A higher percentage of non-profit centres' budgets was spent on care providers than was the case with for-profit centres. Centres allocating a greater share of their funds to the staff had higher appropriate caregiving scores and higher developmentally appropriate activity scores for all age groups.

Note: ■ This is a summary of the findings related to contextual factors and the adult work environment from the United States' Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook et al., 1990) which is annotated at the end of Section 8. An annotation referring to this specific study but focusing on different variables is found in Section 11.

Government regulation

Phillips, D., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1992). **The social policy context of child care: Effects on quality.** *American Journal of Community Psychiatry, 20*(1), 25-51.

This purpose of this study is to obtain information on the factors related to quality in child care. The sample consisted of 227 centres in five cities in five American states with very different levels of regulation. On-site observation used either the *Infant-Toddler Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al., 1986) or the *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980).

The study found that:

1. Centres in the state with the most stringent regulations had providers with, on average, more training in early childhood education and centres with lower turnover rates.

2. In the infant, toddler and preschool rooms, caregiving was found to be of statistically lower quality in the state with the lowest requirements than in centres in the other four states.

3. Centres in the two states with the lowest requirements provided fewer developmentally appropriate activities than did centres in the two states with the highest requirements.

4. Staff in the state with the lowest requirements were observed to be significantly more harsh and significantly less sensitive with the children than providers in any other state.

Note: ■ This study used data from the United States National Staffing Study (Whitebook et al., 1990), see the "Note" on the previous page.

Sponsorship of family day care

Pepper, S., & Stuart, B. (1992). **Quality of family day care in licensed and unlicensed homes.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education, 3*(2), 109-118.

This study explores the impact of sponsorship by an agency on family day care providers. It used a sample consisting of 157 day care providers affiliated with one of 19 different regulated family day care agencies in Ontario and 79 day care providers without such affiliation. (In Ontario, affiliation with an agency usually means that the provider not only receives regular on-site visits from a home visitor but also supports such as training, access to a toy and equipment lending library, and participation in a peer support network.) The *Day Care Home Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al., 1983) was used and a global rating of the home was made using a scale developed for this study.

The report includes a discussion of possible reasons for the differences found between the two groups of providers.

The study found that:

1. The mean DCHERS score for providers affiliated with an agency, that is, regulated, and the global rating of their home were both significantly higher than for the other providers.

2. Regulated providers received significantly higher scores than unregulated providers on three of the six DCHERS items related to space and furnishings, five of the seven basic care items, one of the four language items, two of the four social development items and all three items pertaining to adult needs.

See also

Section 1

Friendly, M. (1994). **Child care policy in Canada: Putting the pieces together**. Chapters 10 & 11. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley, Ltd.

Section 5

Scarr, S., Phillips, D., McCartney, K., & Abbott-Shim, M. (1993). **Quality of child care as an aspect of family and child care policy in the United States.** *Pediatrics, 91*(1), Part 2, 182-188.

Section 8

Phillips, D.A., Howes, C., & Whitebook, M. (1992). **The social policy context of child care: Effects on quality.** *American Journal of Community Psychology, 20*(1), 25-51.

Section 15

Pence, A., & Goelman, H. (1991). **The relationship of regulation, training and motivation to quality of care in family day care.** *Child & Youth Care Forum, 20*(2), 83-101.

SECTION 14: CHILD CARE SUPPORT SERVICES

Introduction

The term "child care support services" refers to a variety of programs which provide support to family day care providers and parents. These services include, but are not limited to: the provision of child development and child rearing information; child-parent/child care provider drop-in programs; parent and/or child care provider mutual support groups; toy and equipment lending libraries; and child care referral registries.

Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres. (1990). **Caring about families: The "how to" manual for developing Canadian family resource programs**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres.

This comprehensive manual was designed to assist people to develop and operate a family resource centre by providing information on: a) assessing a community's needs and potential sources of funding; b) examples of various types of support services; c) sample policies, guidelines, and job descriptions; d) developing an organizational structure; e) administration issues; f) personnel issues; g) volunteer development; and h) public relations and publicity.

Note: ■ This organization also publishes a national directory of toy libraries and parent resource centres.

Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres. (1989). **Strengthening families, cherishing children: Canadian family resource services in theory and practice**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres.

This report provides an overview of family resource services across Canada and contains descriptions for 26 programs from different parts of Canada and offers different combinations of services. The descriptions generally contain information about the program's goals, history, range of services, users, and staffing patterns. There are also four articles: a) shared goals and philosophies; b) funding; c) parent education; and d) the importance of play, and a list of resource centres with the name of a contact person for each.

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1987). **A survey of child care support services**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

This report provides information to define the essential core service components of child care support programs in Ontario and to develop funding and program policies. The sample consisted of 115 programs which, at the time, represented the total population of child care support services in Ontario. A mail-out questionnaire and a telephone follow-up for each program were utilized. There was also a literature review and telephone interviews conducted with key informants.

This report includes: a) a summary of the literature review which identified experience in other jurisdictions and the apparent needs of parent and child care providers who use these services; b) program information

on factors such as services offered and staffing; c) a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of serving parents and providers in the same program; d) a discussion of key issues such as accountability and the issue of liability when operating a care provider registry; and e) identification of what has been learned from experience. A bibliography is also provided.

SECTION 15: FAMILY DAY CARE

This section is divided as follows:

- **Overview documents**
- **Predictors of quality**
- **Support to family day care providers**
- **Regulation**

Note: ■ Section 5, Family Policy and Child Care in Other Countries, also includes material related to family day care.

Overview documents

Peters, D., & Pence, A. (1992). **Family day care: Current research for informed public policy**. New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press.

This book of articles by Canadian and American researchers provides an overview and discussion of current policy issues in family day care. The following topics are covered: a) perspectives on the social, economic and historical context of family day care in Canada and the United States; b) family day care for different groups of children; c) the physical setting; d) parent-provider relationships; e) training and professionalism; f) support services; and g) quality.

Kontos, S. (1992). **Family day care: Out of the shadows and into the limelight**. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

This review of American and Canadian research reports summarizes the research literature on family day care. Sections on: a) how family day care is delivered; b) the characteristics of family day care providers in the United States; c) the characteristics of client families; d) the issue of licensing and accreditation; and e) training, are included.

Hofferth, S.L., & Kisker, E.E. (1991). **Family day care in the United States, 1990**. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

The purpose of this study was to collect basic information on a nationally representative sample of unregulated family day care providers in the United States. A sample consisting of 60 unregulated family day care providers was utilized. The study used a telephone interview which used a standard interview protocol as a measurement tool. The report includes findings related to: a) family day care provider

characteristics; b) child characteristics; c) types of services offered by family day care providers; d) provider qualifications; and e) fees.

Note: ■ A large proportion of the family day care providers who were identified through initial interviews denied being providers when they were contacted for the actual survey interview. This introduces the possibility of sample bias. Therefore, generalizations based on the data should be made with caution.

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1988). **A survey of private home day care in Ontario, 1988**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

This survey provides an overview of family day care agencies, the programs they offer, and the providers who work in this system. A sample consisting of 70 Ontario family day care agencies, 172 family day care providers, 41 home visitors (agency staff responsible for supervising the providers), and 237 parents was utilized. Four separate mail-out questionnaires were designed for this study. The report includes the findings related to: a) characteristics of the agencies, the family day care providers, the home visitors, and the families being served; b) turnover rates of children and staff; c) recruiting, selecting, and training the providers; d) the role of the home visitor and the services provided by the agencies to families and family day care providers; e) the perceptions of parents; f) fees and other funding issues; and g) compliance with legislation and concerns about legislative requirements.

Note: ■ The findings of this study related specifically to human resources are annotated in Section 12.

Predictors of quality

Quality child care has been defined by the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, (1991 in **Factors related to quality in child care: A review of the literature**) as child care which:

- supports and facilitates the child's physical, emotional, social and intellectual well-being and development; and
- supports the family in its child rearing role.

Pence, A., & Goelman, H. (1991). **The relationship of regulation, training and motivation to quality of care in family day care.** *Child & Youth Care Forum, 20*(2), 83-101.

This study examines the relationship between family day care provider regulatory status, specific training, and personal motivation, and the quality of care provided to the children. A sample consisting of 46 British Columbia family day care providers was utilized. Structured telephone interviews and in-home observations using the *Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment* (HOME) scale (Caldwell & Bradley, 1978) and the *Day Care Home Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al., 1983) were used.

The study finds that:

1. There was no difference in demographic factors between day care providers obtaining high or low scores on the two measures of quality.

2. There was a significant relationship between high quality care and formal training specifically related to the provision of family day care, being regulated, and a perception of family day care as a professional career. General courses in child development and the availability of support systems did not predict the quality of care observed.

3. The self-reported amount of conversation with parents was significantly greater for higher quality day care providers than for lower quality providers.

Fischer, J.L., & Eheart, B.K. (1991). **Family day care: A theoretical basis for improving quality.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6,* 549-563.

This study examines the separate and interactive effects of day care providers' demographic characteristics, training, support networks, business practices, and stability of services on care provider practice. A sample consisting of 177 family day care providers in the United States, (115 regulated, 59 unregulated, and three in the process of applying to be regulated) was utilized. Telephone interviews with the total sample using a standard interview protocol and in-home observations of 18 regulated and 18 unregulated providers using the *Family Day Care Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1984) were used.

The study found that:

1. Training in child care accounted for over half the variance in the ratings of provider practice. The combination of child care training, affiliation with support networks, and years of formal schooling explained 69.8% of the variance in observed practice.

2. Provider's regulatory status was the only other variable which had an impact on practice, but not at a statistically significant level.

Note: ■ Over half the providers in both the regulated and the unregulated group who were approached to participate in the home observation part of the study refused to do so. This introduces the possibility of a self-selection bias.

Nelson, M.J. (1989). **Does training make a difference?** ERIC document No. 309 873.

This study evaluates a training program for family day care providers. A sample consisting of 62 family day care providers in the United States was utilized. The *Family Day Care Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1984) was used as a pretest before training and then afterwards as a post-test. The study finds that there were mean gains on each sub-scale at the time of post-testing; the greatest gains were on handling behaviour problems and working with parents.

Stuart, B., & Pepper, S. (1988). **The contribution of the caregiver's personality and vocational interests to quality in licensed family day care.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, *2*(2), 99-109.

This study examines the impact of day care provider personality characteristics, vocational interests, and training on quality. The sample consisted of 161 family day care providers from 19 regulated family day care agencies in Ontario. Two standardized questionnaires were used, one related to personality and the other to vocational interests. Two questionnaires were developed for the study, one to collect demographic information and the other on child care attitudes. In addition, the Harms et al. (1983) *Day Home Environment Rating Scale* (DCHERS); and a global rating of the home using a scale developed for the study were used.

The study finds that:

1. Providers obtaining the highest DCHERS scores and highest rating on the global observation scale were rated on the personality scale as intellectually curious and assertive and with fewer traditional vocational interests than those providing lower quality care.

2. Providers with post secondary school education obtained higher DCHERS scores and higher global ratings than those with secondary school graduation or less. Those whose post secondary school education was directly related to early childhood education or elementary teaching obtained higher scores than those whose post-secondary school education was in other fields.

3. Providers who had specific provider training related to the provision of family day care received higher scores on the DCHERS than those who had not. There was no difference between providers who had received other types of training, such as parent effectiveness, and those who had not received training.

4. Providers who had previously worked in the child care field received higher DCHERS scores than did providers without this experience.

Jones, S.N., & Meisels, S.J. (1987). **Training family day care providers to work with special needs children.** *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, *7*(1), 1-12.

This study evaluates the impact of training on the ability of family day care providers to integrate children with special needs into their program and to provide appropriate and stimulating care for such children. A sample consisting of 13 family day care providers in the United States was utilized. The *Family Day Care Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1984) and two questionnaires developed for this study, one to measure attitudes towards children with special needs and the other to assess respondents' ability to develop programs for such children.

The study found that:

1. Nine of the participants showed improvement across all sub-scales of the *Family Day Care Rating Scale*.

2. All participants showed a significant improvement on their knowledge of programming for special needs children but there was no significant change in attitudes towards such children.

Note: ■ The participants were self-selected from a larger potential sample. This introduces an unknown bias; for example, it could be that the participants were more self-confident than non-participants.

Clarke-Stewart, K.A. (1987). **Predicting child development from child care forms and features: The Chicago Study.** In D. Phillips (Ed.), *Quality in child care: What does research tell us?* (pp. 21-41). Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

This study explores the relationships between program characteristics and child development in four types of child care (a babysitter in the child's own home, a family day care home, a part-time nursery school, and a full-time child care centre). A sample consisting of 81 children, of whom 20 were attending family day care, was utilized. Interviews with each child's parents and child care provider, and on-site observation in the child care setting were used as a measurement tool.

The study found (specific to the family day care providers):

1. There was no statistically significant relationship between the child care provider's level of formal education and the child's competence. However, there was a non-significant trend for children to be more competent when the provider was more highly educated and had some knowledge of child development.

2. Children did better on measurements of intellectual and social competence when the provider had more one-to-one conversations with them, was positive and responsive, and touched, read to, and gave directions to them.

3. Children were developmentally advanced when the home was neat and orderly, organized around their activities, and contained fewer adult decorative items.

Note: ■ No information is provided about the measures used to measure intellectual and social competence.

Support to family day care providers

Dunster, L. (1992). **Supporting family day care providers**. Ottawa, Ontario: Child Care Providers Association.

This manual provides ideas for giving family day care providers effective support. The following topics are covered: a) the types of support required by family day care providers; b) specific information for providers; c) how to develop and maintain a provider support network; and d) sample forms and policies for family day care.

Fischer, J.L., & Eheart, B.K. (1991). **Family day care: A theoretical basis for improving quality.** *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6*, 549-563.

See the annotation earlier in this section under the heading **Predictors of Quality**.

Independent Child Caregivers Association. (1990). **Who cares? A study of home-based child caregivers in Ontario**. Ottawa, Ontario: Independent Child Caregivers Association.

This study provides general information on unregulated family day care in Ontario. An Ontario-wide sample of 727 unregulated family day care providers was utilized. A telephone interview which used a standard interview protocol was used as the measurement tool.

The study found (related solely to the issue of support for providers), that the most frequently identified types of assistance desired, (in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned) were: a) written and audio-visual information about child care provision; b) drop-in centres and other activities in the community to which children could be taken; c) information on activities for children; d) contact with other family day care providers; e) information on handling behaviour problems; and f) access to toys, materials and equipment that could be borrowed.

Note:
- The sample consisted of people known to the Association; therefore it is not necessarily representative of family day care providers in Ontario. Furthermore, some providers who were contacted refused to participate in the Study.
- Other findings from this Study are annotated in Section 11 - Adult work environment and Section 12 - Human resources.

Regulation

Note:
- There is some discussion about regulation in Kontos, S. (1992). **Family day care: Out of the shadows and into the limelight**. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Pepper, S., & Stuart, B. (1992). **Quality of family day care in licensed and unlicensed homes.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education, 3*(2), 109-118.

This study explores the influence of regulation on family day care quality. The sample consisted of 157 day care providers affiliated with one of 19 different regulated family day care agencies in Ontario and 79 day care providers without such affiliation living in two southern Ontario cities. The *Day Care Home Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al., 1983), was used, along with a global rating of the home using a scale developed for this study.

The study finds that:

1. The mean DCHERS score for regulated providers and the global rating were both significantly higher for the regulated than for the unregulated providers.

2. Regulated providers received significantly higher scores than unregulated providers on: three of the six DCHERS items related to space and furnishings; five of the seven basic care items; one of the four language items; two of the four social development items; and all three items pertaining to adult needs (relationship with parents, balancing personal and professional responsibilities, and using opportunities for professional growth).

Note: ■ This study also includes a discussion of possible reasons for the differences found between regulated and unregulated day care providers.

Fischer, J.L. (1989). **Family day care: Factors influencing the quality of child care practices.** Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1989. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50*, 08A.

This study examines the impact of regulation on the quality of care provided. A sample consisting of 18 regulated and 18 unregulated family day care providers in the United States was used. The *Family Day Care Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1988) was utilized as a measurement tool. The study finds that regulated providers obtained a significantly higher rating on the FDCRS total score and on 15 of 29 individual items.

Goelman, H., & Pence, A. (1988). **Children in three types of child care: Daily experiences - Quality of care and developmental outcomes.** *Early Childhood Development and Care, 33*, 67-76.

This study examines the relationship between quality in child care, the child's experience, and the child's language development. A sample consisting of 24 regulated and 24 unregulated family day care providers and 25 regulated day care centres in Victoria, B.C was used. The *Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale* (Harms & Clifford, 1980), the *Day Care Home Environment Rating Scale* (Harms et al, 1983), the *Child Observation Form* (Goelman, 1983), the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test* (Dunn, 1979), the *Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test* (Gardner, 1979), and structured interviews with the parents and the care providers were utilized as measurement tools.

The study finds that:

1. The mean DCHERS score for regulated family day care homes was higher than that of the unregulated homes.

2. The mean scores of children in the unregulated family day care settings were significantly lower on both language tests than the mean scores of the children in the regulated day care homes or the centres.

3. When the family day care homes with the higher scores on the DCHERS (one standard deviation above the mean, N=15) were compared with the homes which had the lowest scores (one standard deviation below the mean, N=11), 13 of the 15 high quality homes were regulated and 9 of the 11 low quality homes were not.

4. Children in high quality homes engaged with greater frequency in gross motor, fine motor, information, and reading activities, and watched less television than children in low quality homes.

Corsini, D.A., Wisensale, S., & Caruso, G-A. (1988). **Family day care: System issues and regulatory models.** *Young Children*, *43*(6), 17-23.

This article explores various possible types of regulation for family day care. It includes a description of seven possible regulatory and/or support models for family day care. (It should be noted that this article relates to the situation in the United States.) The article concludes that the supervisor model, where a person trained in early childhood education supervises and supports the family day care provider, probably offers the best possibility of consistent high quality family day care.

See also

Section 5

Deller, J. (1988). **Family day care internationally: A literature review**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Corsini, D.A. (1991). **Family day care in Denmark: A model for the United States?** *Young Children*, *46*(5), 10-15.

Hwang, C.-P., & Broberg, A.G. (1992). **The historical and social context of child care in Sweden.** In M.E. Lamb, K.J. Sternberg, C.-P. Hwang, & A.G. Broberg (Eds.), *Child care in context: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 27-53). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Section 13

Pepper, S., & Stuart, B. (1992). **Quality of family day care in licensed and unlicensed homes.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, *3*(2), 109-118.

SECTION 16: SCHOOL-AGE CHILD CARE

Introduction

School-age child care refers to a variety of programs which enrol children from kindergarten to early adolescence during the times that schools are traditionally closed. They may provide service during one or more of the following time periods: before school opens, lunch time, after school closes, teacher's professional days, and school vacations. There appears to have been very little research conducted on the effect of school-age programming on children. The main concerns arising in the professional literature involve the types of training and skills required by workers in school-age child care and the types of activities that are or are not appropriate.

This section is divided as follows:

- **Policy and regulation**
- **Standards and guidelines**
- **Research**

Policy and regulation

Brown, N., Landy, L., Rusoff, D., & Young, N. (1992). **Community programs for kindergarten and school age children**. A response to *Child care reform in Ontario: Setting the stage - A public consultation paper.* (Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1991). Toronto, Ontario: School-age Committee.

This brief responds to proposed changes to the existing legislation and contains: a) an overview of the current situation in Ontario and its effects; b) identification of current regulation; c) the presentation of a vision for the future; and d) a list of recommendations. The recommendations include suggestions for: a) the support of family day care for school-age children; b) funding; c) inter-ministerial cooperation; and d) the role of municipalities.

Standards and guidelines

Albrecht, K.M. (1991). **Quality criteria for school-age child care programs**. Alexandria, Va.: American Home Economics Association.

The purpose of this document is to revise and expand the accreditation criteria of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs (NAEYC) to reflect the needs of school-age children and youth. Produced with the assistance of people working in school-age child care programs, this document contains the following sections: a) interactions between staff and children; b) activities; c) staff-parent interaction; d) staff

qualifications and development; e) administration; f) staffing; g) the physical environment; h) health and safety provisions; i) nutrition and food services; and j) program and staff evaluation.

Albrecht, K.M., & Plantz, M.C. (1991). **Developmentally appropriate practice in school-age child care programs**. Alexandria, Va.: American Home Economics Association.

This document identifies components of programming that adequately reflect the characteristics and needs of school-age children. Section I discusses principles of developmentally appropriate practice for school-age child care in relation to staffing, grouping children, guidance and discipline, the physical environment, and programming. Section II provides examples of developmentally appropriate versus developmentally inappropriate practice in the above areas and in regard to homework support, parent involvement, and nutrition. Because of the scarcity of research on school-age child care, this document is based on developmental research on school-age children and current practice in school-age child care.

Research

Jacobs, E., White, D., Baillargeon, M., & Betsalel-Presser, R. (1993). **School-age child care: A preliminary report**. In I. Kyle, M. Friendly, & L. Schmidt (Eds.), *Proceedings from the child care policy & research symposium*. Occasional paper No. 2 (pp. 49-62). Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This is a preliminary report of four studies which, at the time of writing, were still in progress and are part of a larger longitudinal study. While the report does not give much detail about methodology, and does not present final findings, it provides citations for as-yet-unpublished papers.

This report examines: a) the quality of school-based environments (kindergarten and after-school child care); b) the socio-economic status and size of families of kindergarten children attending after-school on-site programs as well as those of children who return home to mother after kindergarten; c) the relationship between child care histories and kindergarten teacher ratings of social behaviour; d) the social and play behaviours of children who attend after-school programs versus children who do not; and e) the degree of communication between kindergarten teachers and the staff of after-school programs attended by the kindergarten children. The sample consisted of kindergarten children, school-based child care settings, kindergarten teachers and child care staff. The four studies utilized different measures.

The preliminary finding of the report are as follows:

1) There are more single-parent families than two-parent families using after-school child care and fewer children per family in the child care population.

2) The quality of the kindergarten and after-school child care settings, as measured by the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, varies considerable within and between schools. Thus children attending both kindergarten and after-school child care, even though it is in the same school, may experience environments which differ significantly in quality.

3) Kindergarten teachers and child care staff have definite preconceived notions about each others' goals, training, and programs, but even within the same school, rarely communicate with each other.

4) There are significant differences between kindergarten teachers and child care staff, not only in average age and length of experience, but also in type and amount of formal post-secondary school education.

Park, N. (1992). **A comparative study of school-age child care programs**. A research study commissioned by the Ontario Ministry of Education. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

This study describes a sample of school-age child care programs in Ontario, to determine the extent to which the children and their families were satisfied with the programs and to ascertain the degree to which quality care was being provided. A sample of 40 programs was used, which included regulated and unregulated programs, non-profit and for-profit programs, and programs located on and off school premises. Interviews were conducted with staff, children and parents; questionnaires specially designed for this study were used; and on-site observations were made. The on-site observation was done using an observation scale designed for the study and intended to assess: a) interactions between staff and children; b) the balance of activities offered; c) the program; d) the physical environment; and e) provisions for health and safety.

The study found that:

1. About 20% of the staff had a university degree, 37% had an ECE diploma or its equivalent, 17% had some other type of community college diploma, and 26% had high school education.

2. The annual turn-over rate was about 50%.

3. Children were typically in two or three different physical locations and supervised by three or four different adults per day.

4. The most appropriate interaction between staff and children was found in regulated non-profit programs, a more appropriate balance of activities was found on school premises, and a more desirable physical environment was found in programs which had the most highly qualified staff.

ARA Consulting Group Inc. (1990). **A survey of licensed school-age programs in Ontario, 1989**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

The purpose of this study is to obtain basic information on regulated school-age child care programs. The sample consisted of 551 programs. This represented 79% of all programs in Ontario at the time the study was conducted. A questionnaire designed specifically for this survey was utilized. The findings presented relate to: a) the number of children by age group; b) when programs were offered; c) program activities; d) the characteristics of program staff; e) the characteristics of the physical facilities; f) staff:child ratios; and g) linkages to schools and other community services such as sports activities offered by other organizations.

Vandell, D.L., & Corasaniti, M.A. (1988). **The relation between third graders' after-school care and social, academic, and emotional functioning.** *Child Development, 59*, 868-875.

This study compares outcome differences among children who returned home to their mothers after school, attended a child care centre, went to a babysitter, or returned home to be alone or with siblings. A sample consisting of 349 third graders who attended school in Texas was utilized. The measurement tools used were: a) a parental questionnaire to collect information about the child's after-school arrangement when the child was in each of first, second, and third grade; b) academic grades at the end of third grade; c) child scores on standard tests of academic ability; d) teacher evaluations of the child's work habits, academic functioning, and interpersonal relations; e) classroom sociometric ratings while the child was in third grade; f) parent ratings of the child's social and emotional functioning using a standard questionnaire; and g) the child's ratings of his or her own social and cognitive skills and feeling of self-esteem.

The study found that:

1. Children who attended child care centres or stayed with a babysitter after school received significantly more negative peer nominations in the classroom sociometric ratings than did children who returned home to their mothers.

2. Children who attended child care centres after school had lower school grades and obtained lower standard test scores on measures of academic ability than did children who returned home to their mother or returned home to be by themselves or with siblings.

3. There were no differences found between children who returned home to their mother or returned home to be alone or with siblings in terms of the classroom sociometric ratings, academic grades, standardized test scores on academic ability, teacher ratings, parent ratings, or child self-ratings.

The findings indicate that the group of children having the greatest problems were those who attended a child care setting after school. The researchers note that the centres "typically had a large number of children, a small number of staff with minimal training, and limited age-appropriate activities. The poor quality of these programs may have exerted a negative effect on the children in the same way that poor quality day-care adversely affects preschool-aged children" (pp 875). In other words, the researchers suggest that the negative impact that they found among the children attending an after-school child care program may have been the result of poor quality, not after-school child care per se.

See also

Section 12

Yeates, M., Davidson, B., Mitchell, W., & McIvor, W. (1991). **A report on school-age child care training**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

SECTION 17: RURAL CHILD CARE

Introduction

This section is divided into:

- **Overview documents**
- **Research**

Overview documents

Doherty, G. (1994). **Child care for rural Ontario communities**. Background paper prepared for a conference on rural child care co-sponsored by the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and food. To be released as Occasional Paper No. 4 by the Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This document examines the need for child care in rural areas. In rural Ontario in 1991 there were: 282,747 children 0-9 years, and an estimated 73,565 women with at least one child under age 7 working outside the home. In addition to parents working outside the home, self-employed families, such as farmers and tourist operators, have both parents working full-time on the home work site for at least part of the year. A situation in which a stay-at-home mother is available to care for the children is no longer a reality for many rural families. Rural communities require a variety of kinds of child care including: a) child care on a year-round, full-time basis; b) seasonal child care; c) child care offered outside usual working hours of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.; and d) child care on a periodic basis (for example, to cover an emergency).

Ontario experience with rural child care centres, rural regulated home child care, and the provision of child care in the child's own home, is reviewed in this paper and issues to consider are identified for each approach.

Friendly, M., Cleveland, G., & Willis, T. (1989). **Child care in rural communities**. In M. Friendly, G. Cleveland, & T. Willis, *Flexible child care in Canada: A report on child care for evenings, overnight and weekends, emergencies and ill children, and in rural areas*, (Chapter 4, pp. 24-31). Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

This chapter: a) reviews research and surveys on rural child care needs; b) describes some rural child care pilot projects being conducted in Ontario; c) outlines models of rural child care; and d) identifies the primary issues, namely: seasonal work patterns, low population density, the nature of rural finances, and the year-to-year variability in child care needs.

Research

Federated Women's Institutes of Canada. (1990). **Rural child care: Survey Project, 1988-1991**. Ottawa: Federated Women's Institutes of Canada.

The purpose of this study was to determine the needs of rural families. The sample consisted of 1740 families with at least one child for whom child care might be required. All provinces were represented. Forty percent of the respondents lived in rural communities, 38% on farms, and the remaining 22% resided in either small towns or villages. Ninety-one percent of the respondents had one or two children under the age of five.

The study finds that:

1. Sixty-three percent of the respondents regularly used child care. The most commonly cited reasons were: to work outside the home (54%), to provide social interaction for the child (14%), to work at home (11%), and respite care (8%).

2. Nationally, family day care is the most frequently used child care service (used by 67% of the respondents). Fifty-seven percent of the respondents said that licensed centre facilities exist in their area but many found them inaccessible due to distance and/or cost. Less than 20% of the respondents had access to before- and after-school care or drop-in programs.

3. An estimated 40% of children under the age of ten are left unattended while the parent works on the farm or are taken along with the parent as farm work is done.

4. The three principle concerns raised by respondents were: distance (50% of the respondents must travel 15 kilometres to reach suitable child care services); cost (39% of the respondents reported an annual family income of less than $25,000.); and the seasonal nature of child care needs.

5. Sixty-nine percent of respondents stated that, if economic factors permitted it, their preference would be to stay at home and look after their own young children.

The study concludes that rural child care issues are sufficiently different from urban issues to warrant special consideration from policy makers.

Note: ■ This report also contains a number of very specific recommendations.

Brophy, K., Penfold, G., Semple, S., Straby, R., & Sugarman, R. (1988). **Who's looking after our children: A study of child care needs in rural Ontario.** *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, *2*(2), 141-148.

This study examines the type of child care provision best suited to rural needs. A sample consisting of 45 mothers chosen to represent farm, rural residential and village/town families was used. Twenty-one worked outside the home, and 12 worked from the home. The study used personal interviews as a measurement tool.

The study finds that:

1. Fifty-six percent of the respondents used regular child care. There was a marked preference for and use of informal child care arrangements. The reason appeared to be that, within the current range of child care options in rural areas, family day care best meets the need for flexible and seasonal hours.

2. Eight of the 15 farm families had not been able to locate child care and used alternative arrangements such as leaving the child unsupervised in the house or taking the child to the barn and fields while the parent worked.

3. Rural residential families were either well-integrated and had a network of care providers they could use or were recent arrivals from elsewhere and experiencing great difficulty obtaining child care.

Note: ■ This report also includes a brief review of previous research. The sample should be used with caution.

SECTION 18: WORK-RELATED CHILD CARE

This section is divided into:

- **Descriptive and discussion documents**
- **Research**

Descriptive and discussion documents

Mayfield, M. (1990). **Work-related child care in Canada**. Ottawa, Ontario: Women's Bureau, Labour, Canada.

This report describes the following types of work-related services: on-site centres, off-site centres, child care information and counselling services, and child care for shift workers and/or seasonal workers. Descriptive profiles of actual programs are provided. There is also a discussion of labour unions and child care, the advantages and disadvantages of work-related child care, the needs for extended hours child care and child care for sick children, and the issues and concerns of employers.

Note: ■ The report takes a primarily descriptive approach which reports the findings from interviews and on-site visits.

Auerbach, J. D. (1988). **In the business of child care: Employer initiatives and working women**. New York, N.Y.: Praeger Publishers.

This report examines employers' provision of child care benefits and services and attempts to fit this phenomenon into larger sociological questions about the links among gender, family, and work. Part I examines the growing need for child care and provides an historical overview of child care policies and programs in the United States. Part II looks at the different types of employer-supported child care and the motivations for and barriers to employer-supported child care. Part III discusses the potential impact of employer-support child care on society's acceptance of mothers working outside the home and children being in nonparental care.

Research

Beach, J., Friendly, M., & Schmidt, L. (1993). **Work-related child care in context: A study of work-related child care in Canada**. Occasional paper No. 3. Toronto, Ontario: Childcare Resource and Research Unit, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

The purpose of this study is to determine: a) what employers contribute to work-related child care; b) the role of the corporate sector; c) whether employer support makes child care available or affordable; and d) whether work-related child care is a solution which will fill the gaps in current child care services. The sample consisted of 176 programs from all parts of Canada which had been specifically established for the employees of an organization, workplace or development and where the employer continued to provide the program with some ongoing support. The 176 programs represented all such services in Canada which could be identified at the time the research was conducted. Mail-out questionnaires or telephone interviews were conducted.

The study found that:

1. The 176 centres accounted for 2.6% of licensed child care spaces in Canada. This figure compared to 2.3% of licensed child care provided by similarly defined work-related centres in 1984.

2. Most centres served preschoolers, but not infants.

3. Seventy-five percent of the centres had as their main sponsor a public sector employer, most of which were health facilities.

4. The most common form of support to programs from sponsors was full or partial coverage of occupancy costs. Twenty-eight percent received some financial support.

5. Seventy-three percent of the centres operated only within the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

6. Respondents indicated that the fees in 63% of the centres were comparable to those at other child care centres in their community for employee parents and an additional nine centres indicated that their fees were higher than the average in the community. When compared to the average parent fees in each province for full-time preschool care, the average comparable fee charged for employees' children in work-related centres was somewhat higher.

The study concludes that work-related child care is not a growing trend, does not reduce the need for public dollars, does not provide more affordable care, and is not especially responsive to the needs of parents who work other than a standard 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. day. The model is not an appropriate policy response to the need for child care.

Note: ■ This report also describes Canada's child care policy and service situation and analyzes work-related child care within the broader context of child care policy.

Paris, H. (1989). **The corporate response to workers with family responsibilities**. Ottawa, Ontario: Compensation Research Centre, Conference Board of Canada.

The purpose of this study is to determine the family-supportive benefits, policies and practices of Canadian employers. A sample consisting of 385 organizations across Canada (out of 1,600 organizations that were approached to participate) was utilized. A mail-out questionnaire was conducted.

The main findings of the study:

1. Only a small number of the companies surveyed offered support to employees with children. The most frequently mentioned supports were child care information and referral services (8%), assistance to employees with sick children (8%), child care centres (5%), and parent education seminars (5%).

2. The most frequent reasons given by responding organizations for non-involvement in policies or benefits to address the specific needs of employees with children were: they had not heard from their employees of a need for such benefits; they believed this was not the role of their organization; and concerns about expense.

3. Almost 49% of the companies had instituted flexible work time, almost 30% offered the option of part-time work with pro-rated benefits, and more than 25% offered the option of compressed work weeks. Job-sharing was permitted in 19% of the companies. (Employees who have some flexibility in scheduling have better opportunities to meet family obligations such as medical appointments).

4. Of the leave provisions available, bereavement leave was the most prevalent (89%), followed by time off in lieu of overtime (69%) and job-related educational leave (62%). Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they had "special family-related leaves", almost half permitted employees to use personal sick time for family reasons, 50% had extended maternity leave, and almost 25% had pre-maternity leave. In most cases these leaves were provided through an informal arrangement rather than through formal policies.

5. Child care information and referral services were almost equally offered by public and private companies, but child care centres were much more frequently sponsored by public sector companies (20.8%) than by private companies.

Note:
- It is not clear how the sample of companies was obtained or the extent to which the sample is representative of Canadian companies in general.
- The response rate was 24%. This raises the issue of bias since it could be that only companies that either provided support or at least recognized the issue as important responded.
- In addition to the study data, there is a comprehensive analysis of the demographic and social developments in Canada over the past three decades and the implications of these for Canadian families and employers. There is also a discussion of the need for and impact of employer support for employees with young children.

See also

Section 1

Lero, D.S., & Johnson, K.L. (in press). **110 Canadian statistics on work and family**. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Section 4

Bertrand, J. (1993). **Employers, unions, and child care**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care.

Section 5

Dowd, N.E. (1989). **Envisioning work and family: A critical perspective on international models.** *Harvard Journal on Legislation, 26*, 311-348.

European Child Care Network, Commission of the European Communities. (1988). **Child care and equality of opportunity: Consolidated report of the European Commission**. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European commission.

International Labour Office. (1988). **Work and the family: The child care challenge.** *Conditions of Work Digest*, special issues, *7*(2). Geneva: International Labour Office.

SECTION 19: ABORIGINAL CHILD CARE

Introduction

The maintenance of cultural integrity is a major concern for all aboriginal peoples. Indian, Métis and Inuit organizations alike have expressed concern that the general standards for child care programs may be inappropriate for northern and/or remote communities, and that they may be in contradiction with aboriginal cultural norms and practices. There is a strong interest among aboriginal groups in developing child care that is provided and controlled by aboriginal people.

Native Council of Canada. (1990). **Native child care: The circle of care**. Ottawa, Ontario: Native Council of Canada.

This report reviews the relevant literature regarding Native child care and explore the views of off-reserve Native peoples through personal interviews. Issues included in this report are: a) an historical overview; b) a description of Native family structure; c) an identification of policy issues; d) a summarization of respondents' views on issues such as the need for cultural appropriateness and how this might be implemented in child care and staff training for Native child care; e) an identification of the perceived barriers to the implementation of Native child care resulting from current legislation and funding approaches; and f) an extensive bibliography related to Native child and family issues in general and Native child care needs.

Note:
- There is also some discussion of child welfare issues.
- The Native Council of Canada represents off-reserve Indians and Métis. Status Indians are represented by the Assembly of First Nations.

Assembly of First Nations. (1989). **Report of the National Inquiry into First Nations Child Care**. Ottawa, Ontario: Assembly of First Nations.

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the federal government about First Nations needs for child care and their policy preferences regarding its development and implementation. This report includes: a) a discussion of traditional Native childrearing values and approaches; b) an historical overview; c) identification of Native concerns about current child care services, such as inappropriate standards and lack of Native content in current early childhood education (Cambrian College, in Sudbury, Ontario, and Yellowquill College in Manitoba (currently in the planning stages) each have a specific Native early childhood education program and such programs are in the discussion stages in several other provinces); d) a discussion of Native concerns related to current government policies; e) a series of recommendations related to the provision of culturally appropriate child care, the need for policy changes, and child care staff training; f) information about existing Native child care programs in various provinces; and g) a summary of the testimony of each witness who appeared before the Inquiry.

Note:
- A significant amount of this report deals with child welfare issues based on a rationale that for Native communities, child care and child welfare are part of a continuum of family support services.

SECTION 20: MULTICULTURAL CHILD CARE

Introduction

Canada is a multicultural society. Those of us who are Canadian-born but not of Native or Inuit origin retain an identity as the descendants of immigrants. Many of us are first-generation residents. Between 1980 and 1988, over one million people immigrated to Canada, 44% of whom came from Asian countries, 28% from Europe, 10% from Central America, and 5% from South America (*Canadian World Almanac*, 1990, Statistics Canada.) Multicultural education is a sharing of cultures to assist in the understanding and acceptance of the ethnic diversity which is the reality of Canada.

Canadian Council for Multiculturalism and Intercultural Education. (1992). **Multiculturalism**. Special issue on early childhood education, Vol. 14(2/3). Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Council for Multiculturalism and Education, University of Toronto.

This whole issue of this Canadian journal is devoted to multicultural early childhood education in Canada. It includes articles on the following topics: a) introducing multiculturalism into a child care program; b) teacher training for multiculturalism and for aboriginal programs; c) the adaptation of newcomer children; d) helping the newcomer child learn English; e) culturally sensitive care provider practice; f) curriculum development; g) educational assessment tools and measures; and h) teachers and parents as partners. There are also some descriptions of existing multicultural child care programs.

Mock, K. (1988). **Child care needs of cultural and racial minorities**. *Canadian Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education, 2*(2), 111-125.

The purpose of this report is to identify what is required to develop and implement culturally sensitive child care services. This report is based on a survey of the literature and interviews with 65 individuals from various parts of Canada who represented 19 different ethnic groups. It notes that minority groups experience problems related to: a) language difficulties; b) lack of understanding of the system; c) the system's lack of sensitivity to cultural differences; d) culture shock; and e) unemployment, underemployment and lowered socioeconomic status. Respondents to the survey conducted for this report identified a need for: a) good translation and interpreter services; b) at least one person in the centre who can communicate effectively with the parent and child, preferably someone from the same cultural, linguistic and racial background; c) staff training in cultural awareness and multicultural early childhood education; and d) parent involvement. Were choices readily available, most ethnic respondents stated that they would prefer a culturally and racially integrated centre with at least one person who was from the same racial and/or ethnic background as their child and who could speak their language. Most parents felt that such a program would best prepare their child for school while at the same time helping them to retain their self-esteem.

Note: ■ This article is also annotated in Section 7 - Parental Child Care Needs and Preferences.

Kilbride, K.M. (1990). **Multicultural early childhood education: A resource kit**. Toronto, Ontario: Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services.

This resource kit provides materials and information to use in multicultural early childhood education and contains the following:

a) a manual which: a) discusses multiculturalism in general and multiculturalism in early childhood education; b) describes the reactions of new immigrants; c) discusses understanding the immigrant's experience; d) provides suggestions for working with parents from diverse cultures; and e) discusses developing a multicultural curriculum. The manual also contains sections on: a) policies; and b) teaching English as a second language, plus an annotated bibliography.

b) *Hand in hand: Multicultural experiences for young children* by J. Graeme & R. Fahlman, (1990). A series of brightly illustrated children's books with the text on each page in four languages and an accompanying teacher's resource manual which provides additional activity suggestions to complement each book.

c) *Globalchild* by M. Cech, (1990). This manual provides detailed instructions for a wide variety of experiences that are suitable in a multicultural setting or to assist children in a homogeneous setting to understand the culture of others. A bibliography of books and resource materials is also included.

d) a videotape discussing multicultural early childhood education.

Derman-Sparks, L., & A.B.C. Task Force. (1989). **Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children**. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

This comprehensive manual: a) explains the importance of an anti-bias curriculum; b) provides information on creating an anti-bias environment, including tips on selecting toys and materials; c) discusses each of: learning about racial differences and similarities, learning about disabilities, learning about gender identity, and learning about cultural differences and similarities; d) provides a variety of programming suggestions; e) discusses working with parents; and f) provides an extensive list of resource materials, for example, books for self-education and curriculum materials.

Chud, G., & Fahlman, R. (1985). **Early childhood education for a multicultural society**. Vancouver, British Columbia: Pacific Educational Press, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia.

This manual provides: a) a discussion of intercultural sensitivity and cross-cultural communication; b) information about different approaches to and attitudes about child rearing in different cultures and the implications of these, such as differing patterns of interaction; c) suggestions on how to orient newcomer children and their families to the child care setting; d) information about second language learning; e) suggestions for program planning in a multicultural situation; and f) a list of books and curriculum resource materials.

SECTION 21: CHILD CARE FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Irwin, S.H. (Ed.). (1993). **The SpeciaLink book: On the road to mainstream childcare**. Wreck Cove, Nova Scotia: Breton Books.

This book includes the proceedings of a 1992 national conference on mainstream child care, the first in Canada. It includes presentations from the conference which discuss the value of mainstreaming children with special needs in regular, high quality child care and workshops which consider how to get there. The book is a handy reference guide to mainstream child care in Canada, including a resource list of practitioners and advocates and a reading list.

Fraser North Child Care Issues Society Exceptional Care Project. (1993). **Special health care: Recommended practices for the early childhood education field**. Vancouver, British Columbia: Karyo Consultants.

This manual provides a reference and resource guide for programs enroling children with special health needs. Included in the manual are sections on: a) the effective use of a team approach and special consultants; b) specific health conditions and the interventions required for each; c) a glossary of terms; and d) a bibliography.

Irwin, S.H. (1992). **Integration of children with disabilities into daycare and afterschool care systems**. Produced for the Disabled Persons Unit, Health and Welfare, Canada. Sydney, Nova Scotia: SpeciaLink: Day Care Mainstream Information Network.

The purpose of this report is to: a) provide information about the current level of integration of children with disabilities in child care programs across Canada; b) identify provincial incentives; c) determine the critical issues with respect to integration; and d) identify the critical characteristics of programs that successfully integrate children with disabilities. The report was created using a comprehensive literature review, a telephone interview with the director of child care and three other key informants in each province, and on-site visits to ten programs.

This report includes: a) an annotated bibliography which addresses issues such as the philosophy behind integration, parental attitudes towards integration, accessibility to child care for children with disabilities, child care staff training and development, adjustments required in centres to enable successful integration, the responses of the children without disabilities, integration of deaf children, integration of children with severe physical disabilities, and the impact of integration; b) a description of demonstration programs in Canada and the United States; c) a description of a sample of mainstream child care programs which have successfully integrated children with handicaps and identification of what aspects of the program appear to have enabled it to be successful; and d) a list of national associations for children with disabilities.

Note: ■ This report pertains to developmental, physical, and sensory disabilities.

Roeher Institute. (1992). **Quality child care for all: A guide to integration**. Toronto, Ontario: Roeher Institute.

The purpose of this manual is to identify what is required in a child care centre for successful integration of a child with a developmental disability who may, or may not, also have a physical disability. This manual: a) discusses the role of staff and parents, the development of an individual plan for a child, and the use of consultants and other resources; and b) provides suggestions for parents regarding what they should look for in a child care setting. There is also a bibliography and some descriptive situations with questions which could be used in staff training to stimulate discussion.

The primary emphasis is on children with developmental disabilities but the manual also addresses physical disabilities in recognition that these two types of disability may occur in the same child.

Demchak, M.A., & Drinkwater, S. (1992). **Preschoolers with severe disabilities: The case against segregation.** *Topics in early childhood special education, 11*(4), 70-83.

The purpose of this document is to discuss the rationale for and benefits of integration of preschoolers with severe disabilities and to present strategies for effective integration. In addition to discussing strategies for integration, this article also discusses the benefits from both the perspective of the disabled child and of the non-disabled child. Research studies are cited which have found the following benefits for disabled children: a) development of more appropriate social skills and higher levels of communication skills; b) decreased incidence of inappropriate play behaviour; and c) increased ability to deal with "the real world". Two studies are cited which suggest that preschoolers with disabilities make as much progress in integrated child care settings as they do in segregated child care settings. References for the research cited are provided in the bibliography.

Note: ■ There is no distinction made within the article about different types of disability.

Rubino, C.A. (1992). **An evaluation of the integration model**. Toronto, Ontario: Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, Metropolitan Community Services Department, Children's Services Division.

This study reviewed the progress of children with special needs who had been enroled in integrated child care programs in Metropolitan Toronto from 1980 to 1987. A survey was conducted which examined parents attitudes towards integration and perceptions of success. A literature review on integrated preschool programs in Canada and the United States is included. The findings indicate that progressive self-help, social and communication skills development increased at a greater rate when children were in an integrated program compared to those in a segregated program.

Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services. (1988). **Integrating children experiencing special needs in day nurseries**. Toronto, Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

This purpose of this document is to determine how children with disabilities were being served by the Ontario child care system and in other jurisdictions and to identify key issues in the integration of children with special needs.

Parts I & II provide a background and a review of the relevant literature on integration in child care and the role of staff in such programs. Part III presents the findings from a review of 19 integrated programs in Ontario including information on the children served, program characteristics, staffing and the use of consultants and other resources, and issues faced when implementing integration. Part IV reviews the use of specialist and support services and the issues related to this. Part V identifies and discusses the major issues to be addressed when integrating a child with special needs. There is also an extensive bibliography and glossary of terms.

Note: ■ The report defines a child with special needs as being one with a developmental, physical, or sensory disability, a communication problem, and/or a behaviour problem.

Appendix I

Author Index

A

Abbott-Shim, M., ***43, 79***
A.B.C. Task Force, ***106***
Alberta Family and Social Services, ***18***
Albrecht, K.M., ***56, 59, 91, 92***
Andersson, B-E., ***47***
ARA Consulting Group Inc., ***93***
Assembly of First Nations, ***103***
Atten, D.W., ***68***
Auerbach, J. D., ***99***

B

Baillargeon, M., ***92***
Baker, M., ***29***
Battle, K., ***30***
Beach, J., ***4, 100***
Belsky, J., ***46***
Berk, L., ***68***
Bertrand, J., ***4, 34, 102***
Betsalel-Presser, R., ***92***
Blain, C., ***10***
Blais-Bates, H., ***10, 11***
Blau, D.M., ***34***
Belsky, J., ***46***
Berkowitz, J., ***3***
British Columbia Ministry of Women's Equality, ***18***
British Columbia Task Force on Child Care, ***19***
Broberg, A.G., ***38, 43***
Brockman, L.M., ***3, 11, 12, 51***
Brophy, K., ***96***
Brown, M., ***10***
Brown, N., ***91***

C

Cameron, B., ***4***
Cameron, V., ***9, 35***
Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres, ***81***
Canadian Child Care Federation, ***56, 64, 69, 75***
Canadian Council for Multiculturalism and Intercultural Education, ***105***
Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association, ***6, 64, 69***
Canadian National Day Care Research Network, ***2***
Canadian Labour Congress, ***6***
Canadian Paediatric Society, ***59***

Caruso, G-A., ***90***
Charlesworth, M., ***11***
Child Care Connection - Nova Scotia, ***14***
Child Care Consultation Panel to the Minister of Health and Human Resources, ***19***
Childcare Resource and Research Unit, ***20***
Chud, G., ***106***
Clarke-Stewart, K.A., ***45, 87***
Cleveland, G., ***9, 33, 95***
Clutterbuck, P., ***32***
Cooke, K., ***9***
Co-ordinators of Early Childhood Programs, Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts & Technology, ***72***
Corasaniti, M.A., ***49, 57, 90, 94, 97***
Corsini, D.A., ***41, 90***
Cozier-Smith, D., ***3***

D

David, T.G., ***61***
Davidson, B., ***72, 94***
Deller, J., ***40, 90***
Demchak, M.A., ***108***
Derman-Sparks, L., ***106***
Doherty, G., ***53, 56, 71, 75, 95***
Dowd, N.E., ***42, 43, 102***
Downie, P., ***11***
DPA Group, ***10***
Drinkwater, S., ***108***
Dunster, L., ***87***

E

E.E. Hobbs and Associates Ltd. ***9***
Edelman, M.W., ***34***
Edwards, R., ***9***
Eheart, B.K.,***85, 88***
Esbensen, S., ***10***
European Child Care Network, Commission of the European Communities, ***39, 102***

F

Fahlman, R., ***106***
Federated Women's Institutes of Canada, ***96***
Field, T., ***47***
Fischer, J.L., ***85, 88, 89***
Fitzgerald, K., ***34***
Fraser North Child Care Issues Society Exceptional Care Project, ***59, 107***
French-American Foundation, ***42***

Friendly, M., *2, 5, 8, 35, 79, 95, 100*
Friesen, B.K., *73, 76*

G

Galaway, B., *31*
Glick, N., *3*
Goelman, H., *2, 3, 51, 71, 79, 84, 89*
Greenman, J., *61*
Griffin, S., *3*
Gunderson, M., *9*

H

Hartman, H.I., *35, 63*
Hayes, C.D., *44, 46, 53*
Health and Welfare Canada, *6*
Henderson, V.K., *49, 56*
Hewlett, S.A.,*29, 44*
Hofferth, S.L., *83*
Howe, N., *1*
Howes, C., *41, 46, 48, 54, 55, 56, 65, 68, 74, 77, 78, 79*
Hudson, J., *31*
Hwang, C.-P., *38, 42, 43, 90*
Hyatt, D.E., *33*

I

Independent Child Caregivers Association, *67, 70, 88*
International Labour Office, *40, 102*
Irwin, S.H., *107*

J

Jacobs, E., *1, 92*
Johnson, K.L., *3, 102*
Jones, S.N., *86*
Jorde-Bloom, P., *63*

K

Kahn, A.J., *38*
Kamerman, S.B., *37, 38*
Katz, L., *73*
Kilbride, K.M., *106*
Kisker, E.E., *83*
Kitchen, B., *32*

Kontos, S., ***67, 83***
Kuiken, J., ***9***
Kyle, I., ***10, 17***

L

LaBarge, D., ***10***
Lalonde-Graton, M., ***9, 15***
Lamb, M.E., ***38***
Landy, L., ***91***
Lero, D.S., ***3, 10, 11, 12, 17, 51, 102***
Lewis, L., ***3***
Lochhead, C., ***31***
London, J., ***9***

M

Manitoba Child Care Association Inc., ***17***
Manitoba Child Care Task Force, ***17***
Marx, E., ***41, 74***
Mathien, J., ***8***
Mayfield, M., ***9, 99***
McCartney, K., ***43, 46, 79***
McDonell, L., ***3***
McIvor, W., ***72, 94***
McMahan, I.D., ***41***
McQuaig, L., ***32, 35, 44***
Meisels, S.J., ***86***
Melhuish, E.C., ***38***
Miller-Chenier, N., ***10, 11***
Milner, J.S., ***68***
Mitchell, A., ***32***
Mitchell, M., ***8***
Mitchell, W., ***72, 94***
Mock, K.R., ***9, 52, 105***
Moore, A.J., ***34***
Moore, G.T., ***61***
Morgan, G., ***73***
Moss, P., ***38, 39***

N

National Anti-Poverty Organization, ***6***
Native Council of Canada, ***103***
National Council of Welfare, ***7***
Nelson, M.J., ***85***
New Brunswick Advisory Council on the Status of Women, ***13***

Norpark Computer Design Inc., ***20***
Nova Scotia Round Table on Day Care, ***14***
Novick, M., ***32***
Nuttall, S., ***3, 51***

O

L'Office des services de garde à l'enfance, Québec, ***15***
Olmsted, P.P., ***39***
Oloman, M., ***5, 35***
Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care, ***4, 16, 35***
Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, ***15, 21, 45, 53, 68, 70, 72, 74, 81, 84, 109***

P

Palmer, J.L., ***44, 46, 53***
Paris, H., ***101***
Park, N., ***93***
Pearce, D.M., ***35, 63***
Pence, A.R., ***3, 11, 20, 51, 71, 79, 83, 84, 89***
Penfold, G., ***96***
Pépin, L., ***8***
Pepper, S., ***71, 78, 86, 88, 90***
Peters, D.L., ***74, 83***
Phillips, D.A., ***43, 46, 54, 55, 56, 65, 68, 77, 78, 79***
Phillips, S.D., ***7, 53***
Plantz, M.C., ***92***
Pollard, J., ***30***
Power, D., ***10***
Powers, C.P., ***49***

Q

Québec Secrétariat à la famille, **14**

R

Reisman, B., ***34***
Roeher Institute, ***108***
Rose-Lizée, R., ***9, 10***
Ross, D., ***30***
Rothman, L., ***5***
Rothman-Beach Associates, ***11***
Rubino, C.A., ***108***
Rusoff, D., ***91***

S

Saracho, O.N., ***73, 74***
Saskatchewan Child Care Association, ***18***
Scarr, S., ***43, 46, 79***
Schmidt, L.P., ***100***
Schorn-Moffat, P., ***10, 65***
Semple, S., ***96***
Shields, M., ***3***
Shimoni, R., ***73***
Special Committee on Child Care, ***8***
Spodek, B., ***73, 74***
SPR Associates, ***9***
Sternberg, K.J., ***38***
Stotsky, K., ***10***
Straby, R., ***96***
Stremmel, A.J., ***66, 67***
Stuart, B., ***71, 78, 86, 88, 90***
Sugarman, R., ***96***
Swedish Institute, ***43***

T

Teghtsoonian, K., ***31***
Thomson, T., ***10, 11***
Tienhaara, N., ***10***
Townson, M., ***10, 11, 35***

V

Vandell, D.L., ***49, 56, 57, 94***

W

Ward, E.H., ***73***
Weikart, D.P., ***39***
Weinstein, C.S., ***61***
White, D., ***92***
Whitebook, M., ***54, 55, 56, 65, 68, 77, 78, 79***
Willis, T., ***8, 95***
Wilson, K.S., ***49, 56***
Wisensale, S., ***90***

Y

Yeates, M., ***72, 94***
Young, N., ***91***

Yukon Ministry of Health and Human Resources, ***19***
Yukon Ministry of Women's Equality, ***19***

Z

Zaslow, M.J., ***44, 46, 53***

Appendix II

Title Index

A

Anti-bias curriculum: Tools for empowering young children, ***106***

B

The benefit-costs of preschool child care programs: A critical review, ***9, 35***
A bibliography of Canadian day care research, ***11***
The bottom line: Wages and working conditions of workers in the formal day care market, ***10, 65***
A brief to the Legislative Committee on Bill C-144, ***6***
A brief to the Legislative Committee on Bill C-144: The Canada Child Care Act, ***6***

C

Canada's social programs: Under attack, ***32, 35***
Canadian child care in context: Perspectives from the provinces and territories, ***3, 20***
Canadian National Child Care Study, ***2***
- Canadian child care in context: Perspectives from the provinces and territories, ***3, 20***
- Introductory Report, ***3***
- Parental work patterns and child care needs, ***3***
- Patterns of child care in one- and two-parent families, ***3***
- Stay-at-home parents: An option for Canadian families, ***3***
- Where are the children? An analysis of child care arrangements used while parents, work or study, ***3, 52***
- Where are the children? An overview of child care arrangements in Canada, ***3, 52***
- Work place benefits and flexibility: A perspective on parents' experiences, ***3***

110 Canadian statistics on work and family, ***3, 102***
Career progression in early care and education: A discussion paper, ***73***
Caregiver characteristics, ***71***
Caregivers' perceptions of working conditions in a child care environment, ***67***
Caring about families: The "how to" manual for developing Canadian family resource programs, ***81***
Caring for a living, ***64, 69***
Caring for Canada's children: A special report on the crisis in child care, ***8***
Caring for children, ***4***
Caring spaces, learning places: Children's environments that work, ***61***
Child abuse potential and work satisfaction in day care employees, ***68***
A child care agenda for the 90s: Putting the pieces together, ***4, 35***
- Caring for children, ***4***
- Child care funding, ***5***
- Child care in a public policy context, ***5***
- A comprehensive system of child care, ***4***
- Structure and management, ***4***

Child care: A better alternative, ***7***
Child care: A community partnership, ***18***
Child care and equality of opportunity: Consolidated report of the European Commission, ***39, 102***
Child care and taxation in Canada: Who pays?, ***10***

Child care as an adult work environment, ***56, 65, 68, 77***
Child care fees: The financial squeeze on families, ***9***
Child care for Canadian children and families, Occasional paper No. 1, ***5***
Child care for rural Ontario communities, ***95***
Child care funding, ***5, 35***
Child care in a public policy context, ***5, 35***
Child care in Canada: Provinces and territories 1993, ***20***
Child care in context: Cross-cultural perspectives, ***38***
Child care in Québec: An overview, ***9, 15***
Child care in rural communities, ***95***
Child care in Sweden, ***43***
Child care needs of cultural and racial minorities, ***52***
Child care needs of cultural minorities, ***9, 105***
Child care needs of immigrants, ***11***
Child care parental leave and the under 3's: Policy innovation in Europe, ***38***
Child care policies and programs: An international overview, ***37***
Child care policy in Canada: Putting the pieces together, ***2, 79***
Child care research: A case for Canadian national standards, ***1***
The child care story: The struggle, the reality, the vision, ***18***
Child care: The bottom line, ***34***
Child care - What the public said, ***8***
Child neglect in rich nations, ***29, 44***
Childcare in the European Communities 1985-1990, ***39***
Children in three types of child care experiences: Daily experiences - Quality of care and developmental outcomes, ***89***
Choices for child care: Now and the future, ***8***
Community programs for kindergarten and school age children, ***91***
A comparative analysis of child care legislation, ***20***
A comparative study of school-age child care programs, ***93***
A comprehensive system of child care, ***4***
Contextual factors, ***56, 75***
Contextual factors and child care quality, ***56, 75***
The contribution of the caregiver's personality and vocational interests to quality in licensed family day care, ***86***
The corporate response to workers with family responsibilities, ***101***
The cost and benefits of a national child care system in Canada, ***35***

D

Day care and the quest for professionalism: Issues and dilemmas in traditional women's work, ***73***
Day care in Canada, ***2***
Day care for young children: International perspectives, ***38***
Day care quality and children's free play activities, ***49***
Day care quality: Its definition and implementation, ***10***
Day care standards in Canada, ***10, 11***
Description of child care training programs in Canadian and international jurisdictions, ***21, 74***

Developmentally appropriate practice in school-age child care programs, ***92***
Does training make a difference?, ***85***

E

Early childhood education for a multicultural society, ***106***
Early childhood education: Professional competencies, ***72***
Early childhood teacher preparation, ***73***
Economic issues related to child care and early childhood education, ***34***
Economics and child care policy, ***33***
The economics of child care, ***34***
The effect of price on the choice of child care arrangements, ***33***
The effects of child care, ***46***
The effects of day care on children, families and communities: A review of the research literature, ***10***
Effects of day-care on cognitive and socioemotional competence of thirteen-year-old Swedish School children, ***47***
Effects of public day-care: A longitudinal study, ***47***
The effects of the spatial definition of behavior settings on children's behavior: A quasi-experimental field study, ***61***
Employers, unions, and child care, ***34, 102***
Enforcement of provincial day care standards, ***11***
Envisioning work and family: A critical perspective on international models, ***42, 43, 102***
Ethical behaviour in early childhood education: Expanded edition, ***73***
An evaluation of the integration model, ***108***
An exploratory review of selected issues in for-profit versus not-for-profit child care, ***9***

F

Factors related to quality child care: A review of the literature, ***53, 84***
Families and children in Ontario: Supporting the parenting role, ***17***
Family day care: A theoretical basis for improving quality, ***85, 88***
Family day care: Current research for informed public policy, ***83***
Family day care: Factors influencing the quality of child care practices, ***89***
Family day care in Denmark: A model for the United States?, ***41, 90***
Family day care in the United States, 1990, ***83***
Family day care internationally: A literature review, ***40, 90***
Family day care: Out of the shadows and into the limelight, ***83, 88***
Family day care: System issues and regulatory models, ***90***
Family policy, ***32***
Family poverty in Canada, 1991, ***31***
Family security in insecure times, ***30***
Financing child care through the Canada Assistance Plan, ***10, 11***

G

Government spending on child care in Canada, ***10***
A great place to work: Improving conditions for staff in young children's programs, ***63***

H

High skill and low pay: The economics of child care work, ***35, 63***
The historical and social context of child care in Sweden, ***43, 90***
A home is not a school: The effects of child care on children's development, ***45***
How nations serve young children: Profiles of child care and education in 14 countries, ***39***

I

Ideology, social policy and home-based child care, ***30***
The impact of child care on children's well-being and development, ***45***
Implications of daycare policies on female labour market behaviour, ***9***
In the business of child care: Employer initiatives and working women, ***99***
The informal child care market: Public policy for private homes, ***11***
Integrating children experiencing special needs in day nurseries, ***109***
Integration of children with disabilities into daycare and afterschool care systems, ***107***
International perspectives on child care policies and programs, ***37***
Introductory Report, ***3***

J

Job creation in the child care industry, ***10***

L

Latchkey children, ***9***
Let's talk about child care in the Yukon: A green paper, ***19***
A longitudinal study of children with day care experiences of varying quality, ***49, 56***

M

Meeting the need: A fairer, better system for Albertans: A White Paper on reforms to Alberta's day care program, ***18***
Moving towards quality child care: Reflections on child care policy in Canada, ***2***
Multicultural early childhood education: A resource kit, ***106***
Multiculturalism, ***105***
Municipal initiatives in child care, ***10***

N

National day care costing model, ***10***
National strategy on child care, ***6***
A national review of child care arrangements in the workplace, ***9***
Native child care: The circle of care, ***103***
Neo-conservative ideology and opposition to federal regulation of child care services in the United States and Canada, ***31***

O

Office of childhood services: General orientation, ***13***
On the road to reform, ***16***
An overview of some federal-provincial fiscal arrangements and proposed options for financing a system of child care in Canada, ***10***

P

Paid parental leave policies: An international comparison with options for Canada, ***11***
Parents' needs, preferences, and concerns about child care: Case studies of 336 Canadian families, ***11***
Parental work patterns and child care needs, ***3, 51***
Patterns of child care in one- and two-parent families, ***3***
Policy statement on day care services: A better balance, ***15***
The politics of stealth: Child benefits under the Tories, ***30***
Predicting child development from child care forms and features: The Chicago Study, ***87***
Predictors of intention to leave child care work, ***66***
Preschoolers with severe disabilities: The case against segregation, ***108***
Private home day care providers in Ontario: A study of their personal and psychological characteristics, ***71***
Professionalism and the early childhood practitioner, ***74***
A proposal to cost-share operating and start-up grants to day-care centres: Ten year estimate of the impact on day-care spaces, percentage of need met, salaries, user fees, employment and federal expenditures, ***10***
Provincial day care subsidy systems in Canada, ***9***
Public preschool from the age of two: the école Maternelle in France, ***41***
Putting families first: Plan of action respecting family policy 1989-1991, ***14***

Q

Quality child care for all: A guide to integration, ***108***
Quality criteria for school-age child care programs, ***56, 59, 91***
Quality in child care: What does the research tell us?, ***54***
Quality infant daycare and grade school behavior and performance, ***47***
Quality matters in child care, ***53***
Quality of child care as an aspect of family and child care policy in the United States, ***43, 79***
Quality of family day care in licensed and unlicensed homes, ***78, 88, 90***

R

Raising questions about improving the quality of child care: Child care in the United States and France, ***41, 74***
A real Canadian Child Care Act: A reality or still an illusive dream, ***6***
The relation between third graders' after-school care and social, academic, and emotional functioning, ***49, 57, 94***
Relations between early child care and schooling, ***48, 56***
Relationship of caregiver education to child-oriented attitudes, job satisfaction, and behaviours towards children, ***68***
The relationship of regulation, training and motivation to quality of care in family day care, ***79, 84***
The report of the Manitoba Child Care Task Force, ***17***
Report of the National Inquiry into First Nations Child Care, ***103***
Report of the Round Table on Day Care in Nova Scotia, ***14***
Report of the Task Force on Child Care, ***9***
A report on school-age child care training, ***72, 94***
Review of child care fees, ***9***
Rock-a-bye Brian: The National Strategy on Child Care , ***7***
Rural child care: Survey Project, 1988-1991, ***96***

S

Scandinavian experience in providing alternative care, ***42***
School-age child care: A preliminary report, ***92***
Selective review of infant day care research: A cause for concern!, ***46***
Setting the stage: A public consultation paper, ***15***
Share the challenge, ***17***
Sharing the responsibility, ***8***
Showing we care: A child care strategy for the 90's, ***19***
Single parent families: Perspectives on research and policy, ***31***
Single parent families in Canada: A closer look, ***12***
The social policy context of child care: Effects on quality, ***55, 78, 79***
A sociological examination of the effects of auspice on day care quality, ***76***
A sociological perspective on child care research, ***29***
Spaces for children: The built environment and child development, ***61***
Special health care: Recommended practices for the early childhood education field, ***59, 107***
The SpeciaLink book: On the road to mainstream childcare, ***107***
Stay-at-home parents: An option for Canadian families, ***3***
Strengthening families, cherishing children: Canadian family resource services in theory and practice, ***81***
Structure and management, ***4***
A study of work-related day care in Canada, ***11***
Supporting family day care providers, ***87***
A survey of child care support services, ***81***
A survey of licensed school-age programs in Ontario, 1989, ***93***
A survey of private home day care in Ontario, 1988, ***68, 70, 84***

T

Teachers needs "TLC" too, ***63***
Thresholds of quality: Implications for the social development of children in centre-based child care, ***55***
Towards universality: An historical overview of the evolution of education, health care, day care and maternity leave, ***10***
Training family day care providers to work with special needs children, ***86***
Training needs of resource teachers, supervisors of day nurseries, and private home day care home visitors, ***72***

U

Unequal futures: The legacies of child poverty in Canada, ***32***

W

We care: Yukoners talk about child care, ***19***
The wealthy banker's wife: An assault on equality in Canada, ***32, 44***
A welcome for every child: How France achieves quality in child care, practical ideas for the United States, ***42***
Well beings: A guide to promote the physical health, safety and emotional well-being of children in child care centres and family day care homes, ***59***
Where are the children? An analysis of child care arrangements used while parents, work or study, ***3, 52***
Where are the children? An overview of child care arrangements in Canada, ***3, 52***
Who cares for America's children?, ***44, 53***
Who cares? A study of home-based child caregivers in Ontario, ***67, 70, 88***
Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America, ***54***
Who cares for Europe's children?, ***39, 40***
Who cares for the child in day care? An examination of caregivers from three types of care, ***71***
Who's looking after our children: A study of child care needs in rural Ontario, ***96***
Work and the family: The child care challenge, ***40, 102***
Work place benefits and flexibility: A perspective on parents' experiences, ***3***
Work-related child care in Canada, ***99***
Work-related child care in context: A study of work-related child care in Canada, ***100***
Working together: A child care strategy for the Yukon, ***19, 20***
Working together: N.S. child care talks about: N.S. Day Care Act and Regulations, subsidized seats and salaries, ***14***

ABOUT THE CHILDCARE RESOURCE AND RESEARCH UNIT

The Childcare Resource and Research Unit at the Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto, is a policy and research-oriented facility which focuses on child care. The Resource Unit receives annual base funding from the Ontario Government (Child Care Branch, Ministry of Community and Social Services) as well as project funding to carry out specific work.

The Resource Unit has a commitment to the development of a universally accessible, comprehensive, high quality, non-profit child care system. It contributes to advancement of this system by:

- providing public education, resources and consultation to groups and individuals;
- fostering, developing and carrying out research relevant to child care;
- facilitating communication on child care;
- providing interpretation of research and policy;
- organizing and disseminating information and resources.

The Resource Unit maintains a comprehensive library and database (which are available to the public), provides consultation on policy, research and other projects, and produces an occasional paper series. Students, advocates, service providers, policy makers and others with an interest in child care may use its facilities and resources.

The
Childcare
Resource and
Research
Unit

The Centre for Urban and Community Studies
University of Toronto • 455 Spadina Avenue
Room 406 • Toronto, Ontario • M5S 2G8
(416) 978-6895 • FAX (416) 971-2139
CRRU@epas.utoronto.ca